

THE
Greeks Opinion
TOUCHING
THE
EUCHARIST,
MIS-REPRESENTED.
BY
Monfieur C L A U D E,
IN HIS
ANSWER
TO
Mr. A R N O L D.

Printed in the Year, MDCCLXXXVI.

1811

1812

1813

1814

1815

1816

1817

1818

A DIGRESSION.

Reflecting on the Opinion of the Greek, and other Oriental Churches, holding a Real Presence of our Lord's Body and Blood (whether by Transubstantiation, or not): much mis-represented by Mr. Claude, a French Minister, § 321. Whose various Artifices are detected, in,

- * *Insinuating the Greek's Ignorance, Poverty, Imbecillity; the Latin's Power, Missions, Industry, to gain them, n. 1, 2, 3, 4.*
 - * *Wresting the Greek's sayings to the Protestant's sense, contrary to their plain expressions.*
 - * *Affirming the Greeks to retain their former Church-Doctrine as high as Damascen, or Gregory Nyssen; yet not freely declaring the ancient and modern Greeks to differ from, or agree with, the Protestant opinion, n. 5.*
 - * *Waving the main point, viz. Real Presence (which infers a Sovereign Adoration); contending about Transubstantiation, and that as an Article of Faith, n. 6.*
 - * *Barring all Testimonies, save such as press Transubstantiation.*
 - * *Using the term Vertue unreasonably, (as excluding Substance); and thereby making the Greek opinion contradictory, absurd and indefensible, and then leaving them to make it good: whereas he ought to have confessed their holding a Presence as well in Substance, as in Vertue, n. 7, 8.*
 - * *Shifting all Testimonies against him by disingenuously requiring testimony upon testimony, or by personal exceptions taken against them, n. 9.*
- The Greek Opinion concerning Transubstantiation, if made good, how prejudicial to the Protestant's Cause, n. 10.*

1. *Concerning Transubstantiation.*

M. Claude, in receding from the Latins, makes the Greeks fall short of their own Similitude and usual Expressions, in three Particulars, n. 13, &c.

That Vertue may be taken as well augmentatively, adding to Substance, as diminutively, excluding it, n. 14.

The Common Doctrine of the Greeks carrying further than their Simile, to a total Transubstantiation, Proved,

1. *From their holding the same numerical Body of our Lord, born and crucified, to be exhibited in the Eucharist: present, not by descending from Heaven, but by a conversion of the Elements, and by a multiplication of its local existence in more places, than before, n. 15, 16.*
2. *From holding the Body thus present by Consecration to be Incorruptible, and its Incorruption to depend on its Resurrection, and so to relate to that numerical Body crucified and raised again. Now, the Bread, remaining intire for its substance, or its matter and qualities, cannot*

be such a Body of our Lord as suffers no digestion, or corruption. Yet something in the Sacrament suffers this. For the Greeks then (whilst holding the Substance of Bread to remain) to lay these changes only on the Accidents, not the Substance (eating bread, fed only by the accidents) were without a Transubstantiation to espouse the difficulties of it; and therefore their opinion implies an entire change of the Bread, as well its matter, as form. n. 17.

3. From holding this Body in the Eucharist, whenever broken whole and entire in each piece, — to all distributed, no way diminished. — The Lamb broken, not impaired, ever eaten, yet not consumed. Which things cannot be said of our Lords Body, if the matter of bread still remain. n. 18.

Whereas Greeks and Latins, former and later times may be accorded, this Author, to maintain the variance, seems to fasten on the Greeks an opinion less eligible than Transubstantiation, and to offer violence to the natural sense of their words; leaving the Greeks to stand apart by themselves from Protestants as well as other Catholics. n. 20.

The Greeks confessed by him not to have opposed the Latins for holding Transubstantiation; the Latins never to have accused the Greeks as not holding it. n. 21.

2. Concerning Adoration of the Eucharist. 1. As to their Doctrine.

Granted, 1. That the Greeks allow and pay to the Mysteries in the Eucharist an inferior relative Adoration. 2. A Supreme Adoration lawful and due to our Lords Humanity, where-ever present; and given by Protestants in their Communion. 3. No sovereign Adoration pretended by Greeks or Latins to be given to the Symbols (venerable only with an inferior cult) but to the Body and Blood of our Lord. 4. Real Presence not being contested, but only Transubstantiation; From such Presence (granting its true consequences) follows a lawfulness of Adoration. n. 22.

2. As to their Practice. 5. The Greeks adore after their mode, by inclining the head and body. Whether this be only relative or sovereign Adoration, is understood from their Doctrine and Belief. For, not to allow the extent of their Adoration, as far as their belief of the Presence of the Person adored; and their Worship the same latitude with their Faith seems unjust and groundless: as also to pretend only an inferior adoration given, where the same Communicants hold a supreme due to the Person there present. n. 22.

More Devotions performed in the Western Churches than in the East, from the Berengarian Errors here. n. 23.

M. Claude's Concessions and their Consequences sufficient. §. 1. To dissuade from a Communion opposed both by Greeks and Latins concerning the Eucharist. 2. To persuade rather to the Roman Communion. n. 24.

For trying our Obedience, God permits Evil with many Allurements; Error with many Verisimilarities; yet hath always left evidence enough to clear all necessary Truth to the humble and obedient, not to force the self-confident and interested. n. 25.

In a Search, by comparing Scriptures and Councils, what endless labour and distraction; in Obedience to Councils, what peace and vacancy for better employments! Besides, that the rude and illiterate (the most of men) cannot search. Must these believe a former Church now? or submit to an inferior Church-Authority against a Superior? But this is Schism in them both: and be justly ruined by believing an Authority usurped, that dares to believe one whereto he is bound. n. 25.

The Issue of Scripture-Trial (long since) was a double sense of Scripture: that Sense was declared by one, nay several, Councils. The Party condemned appealed to Fathers and Primitive Church, whose sense (as formerly that of Scripture) being double, was decided again by Councils; but their Authority rejected. And now it is desired that the Controversie begin anew, and return to the Scriptures; or that the Question determine the Controversie; and, whilst Protestants are the weaker party, that all have liberty; for, when the stronger, they too well discern the necessity of Synods for ending differences among themselves, which (tho not held infallible, yet) upon the Evangelical Promises of our Lord's assistance, require on pain of Suspension, subscription to their Decrees, and excommunicate persons teaching the contrary. Witness the Dort Synod. n. 26.

M. Claude's strange Method for exempting from Obedience to the Church, those that pretend not to a Certainty of their new Opinions, considered.

That, if it prove valid, it serves as well Catholics against Protestants upon the same pretensions; and affords both sides the same plea one against the other, in any controversie arising amongst Protestants. Ibid.

If searching the Scripture be so necessary, search there first this main point, that decides all others, and saves endless searches, viz. our Lord's establishing a just Church-Authority for ending Controversies. Ibid.

Much-what the same course takes *Monsieur Claude* in his last Reply to §. 1. Dr. *Arnauld*. For the shewing of which a little more at large, because I am speaking here of the *Eucharist*, and what I shall say, may serve for a pre-advertisement to some, less experienced in this Controversie, that may light on his Book, and are in danger of receiving some impressions from it, prejudicial to the *Catholic* Faith; I beg leave of the Reader to make a step, though somewhat out of my way, yet not much beside my purpose; Remitting those, who think this *Foreign Author* less concerns them, to the prosecution of the former *Discourse*, resum'd below.

The Controversie concerning the Real or Corporal Presence of our Lord's Body in the *Eucharist*, which for several precedent Ages had exercised the Pens of divers learned Persons, who successfully maintained the truth of the Article, and happily secured the Churches Peace, against their numerous new-risen Opponents, became of late years the matter of Contest in *France* betwixt two able and eminent Disputants, *Monsieur Arnauld*, a *Sorbon* Doctor, and *Monsieur Claude* an *Huguenot* Minister. A Combate not only sharp and long, but thro the Manager's skill carried on with specious new Arguments (on the one side) and in a way formerly untrod.

The

The new Doctrine opposing *Real Presence* had boldly (but as it proved unsuccessfully) demanded an hearing and obtained it, being by several *Western Councils* publickly silenced and coerced ; whereupon it seemed to some a fit expedient, for encouraging a cause disgraced, to sound the inclination of the then persecuted (and therefore likelier to join with so thriving a Sect, as the Protestants then appeared) *Eastern Churches* herein, and (if possible) unite their interests, in case they could find them consenting in this main Article.

|| See *Acta*
Theolog.
Wittenburg.

To this end the *Lutherans* (whose Sentiments approached much nearer the truth, than those of *Zuinglius* and the later *Calvinists*) addressed themselves to the Patriarch of *Constantinople*, || *Jeremy*, but so unprosperously, that instead of obtaining the so much desired Union, they got only a severe check and reprehension from him tired with their importunity, and offended at the extravagant liberty taken by them, of differing not only in this, but several other points, from the sense of the whole *Catholick Church*.

But of late years, by the more frequent Negotiations and Embassies into those parts, the Opinion of the *Oriental*s hath been in this matter more fully discovered, by the industry and exact Collection exhibited in the learned Writings of *Monsieur Arnauld*, one of the Antagonists in this Dispute : wherein his Adversary, much pressed by many plain and evident Testimonies produced against him, is forced to summon up all his Arts and Skill in his defence, to support an undertaking he found too difficult to maintain, and too disadvantageous for him to quit, after so much defiance of a just Authority opposing, and such pretensions that the *Oriental*s consented with him and his adherents in the Point.

|| l. 2. c. 1.

|| l. 5. c. 1.

1st. This Author busies himself || to accumulate many Testimonies concerning the miserable ignorance, and decay of Learning, in the *modern Greek*, and other *Oriental*, Churches, as also that of the *Moscovites* ||, even amongst their *Monasticks*, *Priests*, and *Bishops*, which industrious disparaging of their Science shews, he hath no mind to stand to their Judgment. He relates their many Superstitious and ridiculous Rites, and Ceremonies in Religion ; their extreme Poverty ; and so, how easily they are to be gained to say, or do, any thing, with the Money, or, (to speak in better Language,) with the Charities, which the *Latins* frequently bestow on them. Hence these Nations being so ignorant, their sentiments in Religion are less to be valued ; and so poor, their testimony more easily corrupted.

§. 2.

|| l. 2. c. 2, &c.

2. He proceeds || to tell us the many opportunities, the *Latins* have had, of introducing Innovations, and propagating the *Roman Faith* in those Countries. 1. By so many *Western Armies* that have passed thither, for the Conquest of the *Holy Land* ; and have settled there, to maintain their Victories ; and so kept the *Oriental*s in Subjection for near two hundred years. 2. By the inability of the later *Grecian Emperors* to defend their Dominions ; and so, their often endeavouring to accommodate Religion, after the best way for their Secular advantages ; and that was, by a Conformity in it with the *West*. 3. By the continual Missions of *Priests*, and *Religious* of all Orders, (each of them striving to have some plantation in the *East* ;) especially, the Missions
of

of *Jesuits*, thither; who by their manifold diligence, in instructing their children, educating their youth, distributing many charities to the necessitous, playing the *Physicians*, teaching the *Mathematicks*, &c. insinuate also into them their Religion, having corrupted also several of their *Bishops*. Hence we may imagine, these *Missions* of the *Latins*, having thus overspread the whole face of the *East*, and practising so many Arts to change its Faith, it will seem a hard task to prove, concerning any particular *Testimony* procured from thence, that the persons subscribing it are no way *Latiniz'd*, no way tainted in their judgment; and, that they are not already circumvented, and won over in some Points, though perhaps they may still stand out in some others. [All this he doth, to shew the great industry of these *Missions* to pervert the Truth there: But, indeed, manifests their indefatigable zeal and courage, through infinite hazards, to advance it: negotiating the Conversion of *Infidels*, as well as the instruction of *ignorant Christians*: And *Roman Catholics* are much indebted to M. Claude for his great pains, in giving so exact an account of their *Piety*].

3. Having premised such a Narration as this, to be made use of, as he §. 3. sees fit, for invalidating the Testimonies of the modern *Greeks*. 3ly. He declares, that he doth not undertake at all to shew, that the *Greeks* concur with *Protestants* in their Opinion concerning our Lord's presence in the *Eucharist*; and much complains of his *Adversary*, for imposing such an attempt upon him. L. 3. c. 1. — It is not our business here (saith he) to shew; whether the *Greeks* have the same Faith which we [Protestants] have, on the subject of the Holy Sacraments: This is a perpetual Illusion that M. Arnauld puts upon his Readers; but, whether the *Greeks* believe of the Sacrament that, which the Church of Rome believes. And l. 3. c. 13. He saith, — He would have none imagine, that he pretends no difference between the Opinion of the *Greeks*, and *Protestants*: and he thinks that none of the *Protestant* Doctors have pretended it. And, *Ibid.* after his stating of the *Greek* Opinion; To the censure, that he makes it *peu raisonnable*, he saith, * That to this he hath nothing to answer; save, that *Protestants* are not obliged to defend the Sentiment of the *Greeks*: and, that his business is to enquire what it is; not, how maintainable. And saith elsewhere, That both the *Greeks* and *Latins* are far departed P 337. from the *Evangelical* simplicity, and the main and natural explication, the *Ancients* have given to the *Mystery* of the *Eucharist*.

Here then; 1. as to the later ages of the Church, *Protestants* stand by † *Epist. P.* themselves; and the Reformation was made, as *Calvin* confessed it, † a toto *Melancthon* mundo. 2. After such a Confession, M. Claude seems not to deal sincerely, in that, with force enough, he draws so frequently in both his *Replies*, the sayings of the *Greek* writers of later times, to the *Protestant* sense; and puts his *Adversary* to the trouble of confuting him; And, from the many absurdities, that he pretends would follow upon the *Greek* Opinion, taken according to their plain expressions, saith; these intend only, * a Presence of Christ's Body in the *Eucharist*, as to its *Vertue* and *Efficacy*, opposite to its *Reality* and *Substance*; and * an *Union* of the Bread there to the *Divinity* only so far, as the *Divinity* to bestow on it the *Salvific* *Virtue* or *Efficacy* of Christ's

Christ's Body: and * a conjunction of the Bread, there, to Christ's natural Body, born of the Blessed Virgin, but to it, as in *Heaven*, not *here*; to it, as a *Mystery* may be said to be an *Appendix*, or *Accessory*, to the thing, of which it is a *Mystery*. But all this is the *Protestant Opinion*. 3. Again, seems not to deal sincerely, in that, whilst he affirms the *modern Greeks* to retain the former Doctrine of their Church as high as *Damascen*, and the 2d.

|| l. 3. c. 13. Council of *Nice* ||; and again, † *Damascen* not to have been the first, that
p. 315. had such thoughts (viz. of an Augmentation of Christ's Body in the *Eucha-*
† l. 3. c. 13. rist by the Sanctified Elements; as it was augmented, when he here on earth,
p. 326. -- by his nourishment,) but to have borrowed them from some Ancient Greek
l. 4. c. 9. p. Fathers; naming *Greg. Nyssen. Orat. Catechet. c. 37.* (See this *Faber's* words
488. below, §. 321. n. 14.) and *Anastasius Sinait*, who explained their Doctrine
by the same comparison, as *Damascen*, and the *Greeks* following him, did,
yet doth not freely declare both these, the Ancient *Greeks*, as well as the
later, either to *differ from*, or to *agree with*, the *Protestant Opinion*.

§. 4.

4. Having said this; That, however the *Greek Opinion* varies from the *Protestants*, it concerns him not; Next, he declares: That what ever the *Greeks* may be proved to have held, concerning some transmutation of the Bread, and Wine into Christ's Body and Blood; or, concerning a *Real*, or *Corporal presence*, and their understanding, *Hoc est Corpus meum*, in a literal sense, neither doth this concern his cause: who undertakes only to maintain, that these Churches assert not *Transubstantiation*: at least, assert it not so, as to make it a *positive Article* of their Faith. His words, upon D. *Arnauld's* resenting it; That whereas he contented himself only to shew, that the *Real presence* was received by the *Oriental Schismatical Churches*, M. *Claude* diverted

* l. 3. c. 1. p.
157.

the Controversie to *Transubstantiation*; His words, I say, are these, * *In the Dispute concerning the Greeks, our business is only about Transubstantiation; and not at all, about Real presence. For it was to this only, and Adoration, that I formerly limited my self in my last Answer.* But then, as if this might do him some prejudice, he, as it were cautiously, addeth: — Yet I would have none draw a Consequence from hence, that I acknowledge a *Real presence* established in the *Greek Church*, [But here to make his words true, he adds again,] in that sense, as the *Roman Church* understands it. And, what sense is that? surely, by the way of *Transubstantiation*. And so, you see, he pares his words, till they say no more, than just what he said before: That he acknowledgeth no *Real presence*, (viz.) by way of *Transubstantiation*, established in the *Greek Church*. And, this is to say only, that he acknowledgeth them not to hold *Transubstantiation*. Next; concerning the *Greek*, their receiving, or opposing *Transubstantiation*, he hath one Hold more, *Ibid.* — It is not (saith he) our business, to know; whether the *Greeks* formally reject *Transubstantiation*; Or, whether they have made it an *Article* of Controversie between them and the *Latins*; but only, whether they comprehend it amongst their points of Faith, or no: Our Dispute is only concerning this matter. One would think, that he had been chased very much, and driven up to the wall, that to preserve himself safe, he makes so many outworks; and contracts the Subject of his Disputation within so narrow a Compass. But doth he not here

here, for the *Greek Church* also; thus decline, and tacitly as it were yield up that to the *Catholicks*, which they have always professed to be the main Controverſie with *Proteſtants* on this Subject; (*viz.*) The *Real and Corporal preſence* of our Lord; and the *perpetuity* of the *Chriſtian Faith*, as well *East* as *West*, in the constant Belief of this, for all the later times of the *Church Catholick*; which conſent found in the *later times*, is the trueſt proof, from which we may collect alſo the *true ſenſe* of the *former*? And, from this *Corporal preſence* once eſtabliſhed, whether a *Transubſtantiation* be, or be not, neceſſarily follows alſo the *lawfulneſs* of a *Sovereign Adoration*: which renders the Diſpute concerning one of the two Points he conteſteth needleſs; and decideth it againſt him: ſince, an Adoration of the Myſteries practiſed among the *Greeks* he is content to allow, but not, *Sovereign*; Now *Real preſence* makes it out a *Sovereign* one.

5. His way thus far made; and his cauſe pretended not to be concerned, in that the *Greeks* have a different Sentiment of the *Eucharift* from *Proteſtants*; Nor, that they take, *Hoc eſt Corpus meum*, as alſo the *Latins*, in a literal ſenſe, and hold a *Real preſence*: Nor, that they do not reject the *Roman Transubſtantiation*; Or make any Controverſie with the *Latins* about it: And, ſo all Authorities, ſave thoſe that preſs *Transubſtantiation*, being removed from giving him any trouble: Next; For the *Greeks* aſſerting a *Transubſtantiation*, the alledging ſuch *Teſtimonies* as theſe which follow, and frequently occur in their Authors, will not be admitted by him as good, or to the purpoſe. — *That, by the Conſecration, the Bread is changed, and converted into the very, the proper, the True, (or in veritate, in reipſa,) Body of Chriſt, which Body alſo is the ſame with that born of the Bleſſed Virgin, and that ſuffered on the Croſs. — That the Eucharift is not a Figure, or Image only, of this Body, but the very Body of our Lord, united to his Divinity, as the Body born of the Bleſſed Virgin was; Neither are theſe now two, but one. — Unum corpus, & unus Sanguis cum eo; quod ſumpſit in utero Virginis; & quod dedit Apoſtoliſ. And — Calix, quem Sacerdos ſacrificat, non eſt alius, niſi ipſe, quem Dominus Apoſtoliſ tradidit. — That the Bread, that is offered in the Myſteries, is the very ſame Fleſh of Jeſus Chriſt, that was Sacrificed at the time of his Paſſion, and buried in the Sepulchre, and which St. Thomas handled, and which is at the Right Hand of the Father. — That, after the Conſecration, Though it appears Bread, yet, in verity, it is the Body of Chriſt. Or, — Licet Panis nobis videatur, revera Caro eſt. Or, — Nos manet Panis; ſed pro Pane factum eſt Corpus Chriſti. I ſay, ſuch expreſſions as theſe (very uſual in the *Greeks*,) are not current with him for proving a Subſtantial change of the Bread; Or, That the Subſtance of it, after Conſecration, doth not ſtill remain ſo entire as before. For, as for *Ipfum, propium, verum*, &c. he can produce places in the *Fathers*; where they are applied to a *Metaphor*; where the *Poor*, the *Faithful*, the *Church*, are ſaid to be *Ipfum*, or *Verum, Corpus Chriſti*. The Bread is changed into the Body of Chriſt [*i. e.* he ſaith, not in Subſtance, but in Vertue] The Eucharift is not a Figure, or Image of this Body [*i. e.* without all Vertue or Efficacy,] but the very Body it ſelf: [*i. e.* in being ſuch an Image, or Figure, as retains the Supernatural Vertue of it.]*

B

But,

But, still I say; This *Supernatural Vertue* is not the *Body*. And, if the Greek's arguing from our Lord's *Dixit, Hoc est Corpus meum* be good, viz. That whatever is not our Lord's *Body*, the *Eucharist* is not it; It holds as well against *Virtus*, if taken exclusively to Substance, (for such Substance is [*Body*] here, or else, why not *Imago* a *Body* ?) as against *Imago*, or *Figura*; as well against *Imago cum Efficacia*, as *sine*, &c. For — *Non dixit, Hoc est Virtus*, or *contineus virtutem Corporis mei*, but *Hoc est Corpus meum*. And, this being urged by his *Adversary*, the best answer that I see

† L. 4. c. 7. M. Claude makes to it † is; That the Protestants are no engagers for the verity of the Greek's Opinions, i. e. He imposeth such a sense on the Greeks, as makes a Contradiction in their Opinion, or arguing; and then leaves them to make it good. Again: Though it appears Bread, it is truly *Flesh*: [i. e. faith he; The Greeks hold it indeed still Bread in Substance, and not *Flesh* at all: But they mean here; that, though it appears or seems, yet it is not, [simple] Bread: but it is truly *Flesh* [in as much as it now hath the true Vertue of Christ's *Flesh*:] making them say, It is, in truth, that, which yet they hold it is not; save only in *Virtue*, or *Efficacy*: And again, that it only appears that, which yet they hold, that in Substance, and, in truth, it is. And, to render this his Exposition more current, in † his 2d. Answer,

† Part 3. c. 2. he saith, ——— We must not press too much such manner of expressions as these, licet appareat Panis, tamen in veritate Corpus Christi est, lest we make the Fathers speak many absurdities; And so urgeth a place in St. Chrysostom, where the Father saith, ——— That we are not to think of our selves, that we are upon the Earth; because we see the Earth under our feet: for we are translated into Heaven, and placed among the Angels. Where, saith he, the Father denies not absolutely, that we are upon Earth: and so, he thinks himself as safely guarded here against the Panis apparet by this; as before, against the *Eucharist* being pretended to be *Ipsum Corpus Christi* in a literal or a proper sense, by his shewing, that the poor were said to be *ipsum*, or *Verum, Corpus Christi* too.

Such Evidences therefore rejected by M. Claude, he requires, for the verifying of *Transubstantiation*, that we produce a Testimony, such as this; That the Bread is *Transubstantiated*; or, the Substance of Bread is changed into the Substance of Christ's Body. So that, according to him, The Bread, [but, not a Substance,] is said by them to be changed into Christ's Body, [but, not into a Substance]. And, by the same reason, we may say; That our Lord's Nourishment, when he lived here on Earth, being changed into our Lord's Body, proves not, that it was changed into the Substance of his Body; But suppose then the Expression running, as he would have it, ——— That the Bread is changed into the Substance of Christ's Body; and, that though it seems the Substance of Bread; Yet, in truth, it is the Substance of Christ's Body, or *Flesh*, are we ever a whit now the abler to silence him? Or, will not his answers still fit as well as before, viz. That, though it seems, yet it is not the simple, or naked, Substance of Bread. — That it is, in truth, also the Substance of Christ's Body: i. e. containing in it the whole Vertue (or, if I may so say, the Substance) of this Substance?

stance? For so, it may be shewed, sometimes, that Substance is used for Vertue.

He Grants †; the *Greeks* cannot think, *Christ's Flesh*, or *Body*, to be the Subject of those accidents, which are perceived, by our Senses, to remain in the *Eucharist*; and then, the *Greeks* also to say: *Videtur Panis, & Vinum, in veritate Corpus Christi & Sanguis est*; and yet will not yield, that they hold the Existence of these Appearances or Accidents in the *Eucharist* without a Subject. He grants the *Greeks* to hold, *our Lord's Body*, that is distributed in the *Eucharist*, to be invisible, impartible, impassible; and then affirms them (though it is not so) to say; that no other Substance is this *Body*, than the *Bread*; and yet not to hold, the accidents only of the *Bread* to be passible, partible, &c. The *Greeks* say, that the *Body* of our Lord, which is consecrated and offered in many places at once, and at many times successively, yet in all these, is but one, and the same, *Body*: and, that, though it is in all these places broken, divided, and eaten by many Communicants; yet it is received by each of them, not in a piece of it, but whole, and entire: and, after this, remains still, perfect, unconsum'd, alive, immortal. And yet he saith †, the *Greeks* do not hold or affirm; *Idem Corpus in pluribus locis*: do not maintain a Concomitancy of our Lord's *Flesh* and *Blood*; nor the existence of his *Body* in the *Eucharist*, after a non-natural manner. And, that the same *Greeks* do hold, the Substance of that which is offered and distributed in one place, as to one person, to be really and numerically diverse from that offered, or distributed, in another: But, that their meaning only is; that the Vertue of this *Body* is in all places one, and the same; and to all persons, whole and entire; and must he not say also, that this Vertue is incorrupted and alive?

— I yield [saith he, † in Answer to D. Arnauld's Objections touching Remigius] that, if the *Bread* were made the *Body* of *Christ* in its Substance, it would follow, that our Lord would have so many Bodies, as he is united, [i.e. in his Divinity,] to different Breads [this he grants, notwithstanding Remigius his arguing; all these Breads but one, and the same Body, from the same Divinity replenishing them; of which more below]: But, the *Bread* not being made *Christ's Body* save only in Vertue, and in Efficacy, this consequence is null; because this Vertue, through the whole world, is one and the same. — For this is indivisible, and is all of it entire, where-ever it is. Thus he. And, that such are his Answers and Explications, of these expressions of the *Greeks*, as I have here represented, You may see in his 2d. Answer part 3. c. 2. & 4. — His last Answer, l. 3. c. 9, 10. — l. 4. c. 7. — l. 5. c. 7. — l. 6. c. 10. and frequently elsewhere.

[Where chiefly you may observe; that, how punctual soever the Expressions of the *Greeks* are concerning the presence of *Christ's* very *Body*, yet he expounds them only of the Vertue, exclusive to the Substance, of *Christ's* *Body*. And yet this person confesseth that the *Greeks* hold, † — That the *Bread* is made the proper *Body* of *Christ* [opposed to figure] † by the way of Augmentation of his Natural *Body*; so, as our Nourishment is made our *Body*. And yet, elsewhere, more fully — † That [upon the Consecration] they held an Union of the *Bread* with the Divinity of our Lord; and, by the Divinity, [an Union] to his natural *Body*; and that they understood, that

† l. 3. c. 10.
p. 263.

† l. 3. c. 13.

† 2 Resp.
p. 514.

§. 6.

† l. 4. c. 7.

† l. 6. c. 10.

that by the means of this Union, or of this Conjunction, the Bread becomes the Body of Christ, and is made the same Body with it. [I add, as our nourishment, by its union to the same Soul, is made the same Body with ours.] Now then; when we say, that our nourishment, upon such an operation passing upon it, is, or is changed into, or is made, our Body or Flesh, did he candidly here interpret our meaning, who should say, that we affirm only; that this nourishment is our Body, or Flesh, in *Vertue*, or changed into the *Vertue* of it, exclusively to its being also made the *Substance* of it? So; doth this person deal candidly, for instance, when *Euthymius* a Greek Author, that held this opinion, expresseth himself thus † — *Quemadmodum Jhesus Christus, supernaturaliter, assumptam carnem deificavit; Etiam Hac [the Bread and Wine] ineffabiliter transmutat [i. e. by his united Deity] in ipsum vivificum Corpus, & in ipsum pretiosum sanguinem suum, & in gratiam ipsorum.* (Which Grace he explains presently after by this Body strengthening us, as Bread doth; and this Blood exhilarating, and encouraging us, as Wine †;) I say, doth he deal ingenuously, to expound the. [&] here by a [*C' est a dire*] or, [*id est*] — *Transmutat ineffabiliter in ipsum Corpus, & in ipsum Sanguinem, id est, in gratiam ipsorum?* Making the Body a Synonyma with its Vertue; Such a Synonymon, saith he, as that of St. Paul, in 1 Tim. 4. 3. *They who believe and know the Truth.* Or 1 Tim. 6. 3. *Wholesome words, and Doctrine of Godliness.* But might he not have said, more aptly, such a Synonymon as that in Psalm 32. — *Verba Domini Cali firmati sunt, & omnis virtus eorum; firmati sunt Cali, id est, virtus eorum?* Or Psalm 147. — *Magnus Dominus, & magna virtus ejus. Dominus, id est, virtus Domini?* — But, if the *Greeks* mean, as, he saith, indeed they do, — That the Bread, by Consecration, is made our Lord's proper Body, though not that Numerical one born of the Virgin, yet another, added to it by way of Augmentation; and so, in some sense, made the same with it, (*viz.* so, as our nourishment is with ours) by the Union, and inhabitation of our Lord's Divinity to, and in, them both; and lastly, that, by its being thus made our Lord's Body, it hath also the vivifying vertue of his natural Body, inherent in it; then I say; in plain dealing, this Person, expounding the Expressions of the *Greeks*, ought to have confessed their maintaining the presence, in the *Eucharist*, of this *Substance* of Christ's Body, as well as of its *Vertue*; this Substance, I say, of which they affirm, that it is the same with the other crucified so far as, to be united to the same Divinity, and in the same person, of our Lord; and, from this, to receive the same vivifying Vertue; though indeed this new Substance from that crucified numerically distinct. Nor, consequently, ought he to impose upon the *Greeks*, as every where he doth, their holding the Bread, after Consecration, to remain still so entirely Bread, as it was before; but only, the matter of it so to remain, as the matter of our Nourishment doth, when yet that, which was Bread, is now truly our Flesh, and no more Bread; our Flesh, not by I know not what Mystical Relation to it, but by a most interior Reception, and Incorporation into it, and dispersion through that our Substance, or Flesh; which was existent before,

† Comment.
in Mat. c. 64.

† See Psal.
103. 15.

fore. Nor, lastly, using the same integrity, ought he to have said, this new Substance to have been held by the *Greeks augmentative* of Christ's Natural Body, or also to be the *same* with it, (as the *Greeks* always say it is) by reason of a *supernatural virtue* of Christ's Natural Body communicated to it, (as he usually explains them); for one thing may have the *Virtue* of another, without being an *augmentative* part of it, or contracting any *Identity* with it: But, that this new Substance is held by the *Greeks* an accret to our Lord's Natural Body, and the same also with it, from its *Union* to the *Divinity*, and so its change into Christ's Flesh; and so its partaking also the *inep'tias*, *Graces*, or *Virtues* of it; which the *Greeks* speak of, with much reason, as well as of the *substance*, because in these we are most concern'd.

Thus, perhaps with much less labour, might this ingenious Person have comprehended, in his Answers and Explications of the *Greek's* opinion more Truth, and gained from his Readers more belief. And for this, I appeal to any other sober Person, when he shall have considered M. Claude's concessions set down below, §. 9. and the necessary consequences of them, §. 10. But this Person well saw the great prejudice he should do to his Cause, in explaining these Authors in such a manner (which would have made a fair way at least toward a Total *Transubstantiation*,) and therefore judged it safest to hold fast to a *virtual presence*. Now, in this way he takes, many of these Expressions seem so clearly to say the contrary to what he would have them, as a *proof* can hardly be brought against such answers, that will not have as little, or perhaps less, evidence in it, than the thing that is *proved*. And, in such manifest wresting of an Authors clear sense, it is Conscience only must confute such gain-sayers; not an Argument. And, in such cases it concerns the Reader, not easily to resign his Reason to another's engagements; nor suffer his Judgment to be figured with the impressions of every mans fancy, (especially when opposing *Church-Authority*) nor to apprehend difficulty in every thing so long, as he sees it to be contested.] This of M. Claude's Art in evading of such, as seem very evident, and indisputable Testimonies.

6. But, 6ly. Suppose such clear and express Testimonies produced, as that no such answers can discountenance them; nor no exceptions be made against them, then, especially out of the 1st. and 2d. *Observations* precedent, he hath some at least against the *Person*. Urge against him the Testimonies of the *Modern Greek Writers*, such as will admit none of his Qualifications, He tells us, many of them are *Greeks Latiniz'd*, and won over to *Rome*: Or, the writing quoted wants another testimony, that it is not forged; such as lived in the same times having in their writings not mentioned such a Piece; thus he throws off *Samonas*, and *Agapinus*†. Proceed, in adding to these the testimonies of several Dignified persons of the *present Greek Clergy*; and that in several Countries, and Churches of the *East*, distinct, and averse, from the *Roman Communion*, (By a diligent Collection of which, his prudent Adversary, hath done the *Church Catholick* great service, * in manifesting, that the doctrine, and practice of

§. 7.

† l. 4. c. 3.

of

of the *Greeks*, not only touching *Real Presence* and *Transubstantiation*; but most of the other Controversies agitated in the *West*, consents and agrees with the Church of *Rome*, and * in representing to the more ingenuous amongst *Protestants*, how singular they stand, and divided, in their Faith, from the whole Christian world, he tells us: They are the Declarations only of *Greeks Latiniz'd*, and corrupted by the *Roman Missions*: Though the same persons, still, maintain their dissent from the *Latins*, as to those Points formerly in Controversie between the two Churches: and there is much less cause, considering the repugnance to natural Reason, for their corruption in this point of a Corporal Presence, wherein they are made so easily to be won, than in any other of those, wherein they still stand out against *Rome*, and cannot at all be tainted: Lastly, tho' the Testimony they give, is not so much concerning their own particular persuasion; as, what is the *Common Tenent*, and Profession of the *Greek*, [*i. e.* those no way reconciled to the *Roman Communion*,] or other *Oriental Churches*; A matter, wherein a false testimony, as it would carry a greater guilt, so lies too open to discovery. Urge to him the testimony of the *Oriental*, especially persons dignified in the Clergy, that have travelled, about some negotiations, into the *West*: He saith, *l. 5. c. 5. p. 594.* *There is little credit to be given to this kind of People, who come not usually into the West, but for their own Interest; and who fail not to speak in such a manner, as one would have them.* Urge to him the testimony of those of the *Greek Communion*, inhabiting in the *West*, and here indulged their own Service, and Rites, easily enquired into; as for example, the *Greek Church in Venice*. See (*Response. 2. part 2. c. 8.*) his answer to what was urged out of *Gabriel Archbishop of Philadelphia* the Prelate there. — That we are not to think it strange, if one, who had lived some forty years in that place, suffered himself, [and so those under his charge,] to be wrought upon by the ordinary commerce they had with the *Latins*. Urge the *Oriental Liturgies*, which though, not denied to be different in several Regions, or perhaps several also used in the same, (as both *S. Basil's* and *S. Chrysostom's* are by the *Greeks*,) yet have a great congruity and harmony both amongst themselves, and with the *Greek and Roman*, as to the Service, and Ceremonies, of the *Eucharist*.

† His last Answer, *l. 5. c. 5. 606, & 608.* His answer is †, — That we have not any certainty, that these Pieces are sincere, or faithfully translated; or, some of them not corrected by the *Missions*.

As for the *Liturgies* and other witnesses, produced for the Faith of the *Jacobites of Syria*; the *Armenians*; *Coptites*, or *Egyptians*; *Ethiopians*, or *Abyssines*; agreeing in this Point with the *Roman*, he thinks them all sufficiently confuted, from *Eutychianism* being held by these *Eastern*, and *Southern*, Churches. For, saith he †, — What can one find more directly opposite; than, to maintain on one side, that *Jesus Christ* hath no true Body; that there is nothing in him save only the *Divine Nature*; that all that which hath appeared, of his Conversation in the World, of his Birth, Death, Resurrection, were nothing but simple appearances without Reality: and, on the other side, to believe, that the substance of the Bread is really changed into the proper substance of his Body, the same he took of the *Virgin*? Thus he; for his advantage, applying

ing the *extremities* of that *Hereſie* to all theſe Nations, contrary to the Evidence of their publick *Liturgies*. But *Eutychianiſm*, taken in the lower ſenſe, as *Eutyches* (upon the miſtake of ſome expreſſions of former Fathers, *Abbaſius*, and *Cyrell*, *Patriarchs* of *Alexandria*, which perhaps alſo induced the engagement of *Dioſcorus* their Succellor on his ſide) maintained, and the *Ephelin* Council, i. e. above 90. Biſhops, under *Dioſcorus*, allowed, it, affirms no more, than ——— that the two *Natures* of our Lord, the one *Divine*, the other *Humane*, *Conſubſtantial* with us, and received of the *Bleſſed Virgin*, after their conjunction, become one, yet this without any confuſion, or mixture, or conversion of the two *Natures* into one another. Now, that theſe Nations adhere to *Eutychianiſm* only in this latter ſenſe, (they not well diſtinguiſhing between *Nature*, and *Perſonality* ;) I refer him that deſires further ſatisfaction, to the *Relations* of *Thomas a Jeſu*, l. 7. c. 13, 14, 17. — and *Brewwoods Enquiries*, c. 21, 22, 23. — and *Dr. Field on the Church*, l. 3. c. I. p. 64, &c. and of the ſeveral Authors cited by them : and to the teſtimony of *Tecla Maria* a Learned *Abyſſin* Prieſt cited by *M. Claude*, † who ſaith : † l. 5. c. 6. They hold, after the Union, only *Unam Naturam* ; ſine tamen mixtione, & ſine confuſione. [i. e. of thoſe two *Natures*, of which the One, afterward, is compounded]. Which Teſtimony may ſerve either to expound, or to confront, one, or two, of the other he brings, that ſeem to ſay otherwiſe.

Urge to him the *Confefſion* of *Proteſtants*, *Grotius*, *Biſhop Forbes*, and others, (though themſelves of a contrary perſwaſion,) that the Modern *Greek Church* believes *Tranſubſtantiation* : for which they cite their late Writers ; the Reading of whom convinced them in this, though it cannot *Mr. Claude*. Of theſe two *Grotius* and *Forbes*, he replies, || ——— That || l. 4. c. 4. they are perſons, who admitted themſelves to be pre-poſſeſſed with *Chimerical fancies* and *deſigns*, upon the matter of the Differences between the two *Communiſions*, *Catholick* and *Proteſtant* ; which they pretend to accommodate, and reconcile. So he Cenfures *Caſaubon* out of *Spoudanus*, † ——— *Levitatem animi Vacillantem eum perpetuo tenuiſſe ; cum & his, & illis placere cuperet, & nulli ſatisfeciſſet*. Where indeed, whoſe judgment ought ſooner to be credited, than theirs, who appear more indifferent between the two contending parties ? So, To *Archbiſhop Lanfrank*'s words to *Berengarius*. ——— *Interroga Græcos, Armenios, ſeu cujus libet Nationis quoscumque homines, uno ore hanc fidem [i. e. Tranſubſtantiationis] ſe teſtabuntur habere*, cited by *Dr. Arnould*. He answers ; ——— || That. Pre-occupation renders his Teſtimony nothing || p. 361. worth.

Urge the *Socinians*, becauſe the *Fathers* oppoſe ſo manifeſtly their own opinions, therefore more apt to ſpeak the truth of them, in their oppoſing alſo thoſe of other *Proteſtants*, and particularly in their diſſering from them in this point of the *Eucharift* ; He tells us, they are not creditable in their Teſtimony, becauſe ſo much intereſted to decry the Doctrin of the *Fathers* in their own regard ; and thus they imagine, *Proteſtants* will have leſs countenance to preſs them with an Authority, that themſelves cannot ſtand to. Urge the *Centuriſts*, confeſſing *Tranſubſtantiation*, found in ſome of the

|| l. 1. c. 5.

the *Fathers*; and, in magnifying their new-begun *Reformation*, more free plainly to acknowledge those they thought *errors* of former times: He || denies them fit witnesses in this Controversie, because, themselves holding a *Real Presence*, they had rather admit a *Transubstantiation* in the *Fathers*, than a Presence only *Mystical*. And suppose such excuses should fail him; yet how easie is it to find some other, whereby a person may be represented never to stand in an exact *indifferency*, as to whatever Subject of his Discourse?

With such personal exceptions M. *Claude* frequently seeks to relieve his Cause, where nothing else will do it. Whereas indeed such a common *Veracity* is to be supposed amongst men, especially as to these matters of Fact, that, where a multitude, though of a party concern'd, concur in their Testimony, they cannot reasonably be rejected on such an account, either, that their being deceiv'd, or purpose to deceive, and to relate a lie, is possible; or, that, what they say can be shewed a thing well-pleasing, and agreeable, to their own inclinations. For as it is true, that ones own *interest*, if, as to his own particular, very considerable, renders a Testimony less credible; So, on the other side, almost no Testimony would be valid, and current, if it is to be decried, where can be shewed some favour, or engagement of affection, to the thing, which the person witnesseth, and cannot be manifested an equal poise to all parties: and so, for Example, in the Narration of another Country's *Religion*, (often made by all Parties,) none here can be believed, save in what he testifies of them, against his own. Such things therefore are to be decided according to the multitude, and paucity, and the Reputation of the Witnesses rather, than their (*only some way general*) interest; and the Credibility of such things is to be left to the equal Reader's Judgment.

§. 8.

|| l. 2. c. 1.

But, 7ly. Should all that is said touching the later *Greeks*, from the eleventh or the eighth to the present, age, their holding *Transubstantiation* be, undeniably, made good; and, all the Testimonies concerning it, exactly true: Yet he saith || — *It will not follow, that a change* [of the Church's former Faith in this Point] *is impossible: or, hath not actually happened: and consequently, that all M. Arnauld's long dispute, about it, is vain, and unprofitable.* I add; and then, so his Replies. But here, since the true sense, and meaning of *Antiquity*, on what side this stands, is the thing chiefly questioned, and debated between the *Roman Church*, and *Protestants*, (unless he will throw off this too, and retreat, only to *sense of Scripture*,) I suppose to wise men it will seem little less, than the loss of the *Protestant* cause, and too great a prejudice to it, to be so slightly yielded up; if that, not the *Roman* only, but the whole visible *Catholick Church* (besides themselves,) from the eleventh to the present age, doth defend a *Corporal Presence*, and a literal sense, of *Hoc est Corpus meum*; or also *Transubstantiation*; and so, consequently, doth concur, and Vote against them, touching the sense of former *Antiquity*; for this, each side, in their present Doctrine, and Practice, pretend to follow. And I can hardly think M. *Claude*, would seem to spend so great a part of his Book to defend a Post, the loss of which he thought

no way harm'd him. Again ; thus it is manifest, that in an *Oecumenical Council*, if now assembled, the *Protestants* would remain the Party Condemned.

8. After all these Defences, wherewith he seems sufficiently guarded ; He §. 9. proceeds l. 3. c. 13. thus to declare the true opinion of the *Modern Greeks* on this Subject, which I will give you in his own words, p. 310. — *They believe (saith he) That by the Sanctification [or Consecration] is made a Composition of the Bread and Wine, and of the Holy Ghost : That these Symboles, keeping their own Nature, are joined to the Divinity, and, That by the impression of the Holy Ghost, they are changed, for the Faithful alone, [the Body of our Lord being supposed either to be not present at all, or to cease to be so; in the particles of the Symbole received by the unworthy] into the vertue of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ : being, by this means, made not a Figure, but the proper and true Body of Jesus Christ ; and this, by the way of Augmentation of the same natural Body of Jesus Christ. To which they apply the comparison of the nourishment, which is made our own Body by Assimilation, and Augmentation. Again, p. 237. more briefly — The Doctrine of the Greek Church is : That the substance of Bread, conserving its proper Being, is added to the Natural Body of Jesus Christ ; that it is rendred like unto it : That it augments, and by this means becomes the same Body with, it. By this also (he saith, p. 334. and see the same in his 4th. l. c. 7.) the Greeks would observe in some sort the literal sense of the words, Hoc est Corpus meum, which (saith He) we do not ; we understand them in this sense : This Bread is the sacred sign, or Sacrament of my Body. Or, which comes to the same pass, The Bread signifies my Body. They, on the contrary, taking the word [is,] in some sort according to the letter, would have, that the same subject which is the Bread is also the Body of Christ. From preserving this pretended literal sense it is also ; That they would have it ; That the Bread is made one with the Body, by its Union to the Divinity, by the Impression of the Holy Ghost, and by a change of vertue. Or, as he hath it in his 6th. l. c. 10. — That there is an Union of the Bread to the Divinity of our Lord ; and by the Divinity, to his natural Body : by means of which Union, or Conjunction, the Bread becomes the Body of Christ, and made the same Body with it. [with his natural Body.] Again, for preserving the literal sense, That they bring the comparison of Nourishment made One with our Body ; and that they have invented this way of Augmentation of the natural Body [of Christ.] It seems also, That the Modern Greeks understand some real or Physical impression of the Holy Ghost, and of the vivifying vertue of Jesus Christ, upon the Bread, with some kind of inherence, [i. e. of the vertue:] Although I will not (saith he) ascertain positively, that this is the General Belief of their Church, though the expressions seem to sway on this side. But however it be, this is not our opinion. We believe, that the Grace of the Holy Ghost, and vertue of Christs Body, accompanies the lawful use of the Sacrament ; and, that we partake the Body of Jesus Christ by Faith, as much or more really, than if we received it in the mouth of our Body. But we do not understand there this Real impression, or inherence, [i. e. of the Supernatural Vertue of the Body of Christ, || viz. that born of the Virgin,] of the Greeks. Whence it is, that our Expressions are not so high, as theirs. And this Opinion*

See p. 338.

|| l. 3. c. 13. p. 315. of theirs he makes to be as ancient as || *Damascen.* — *This Opinion* [of the Modern Greeks, saith he,] *seems to be taken from Damascen: some of whose expressions I think fit to produce. For it is certain, that, to make a good Judgment of the Opinion of the Modern Greeks, we must ascend as high as him.* — *And M. Arnauld himself hath observed; That John Damascen is as it were the S. Thomas of the Greeks.* Thus He.

§. 10.

|| p. 336.

But, lest he should seem to fasten such a gross Opinion upon the Greek Church as they will not own, nor others easily believe, they maintain; (for he confesseth, that it hath something in it, that appears *little reasonable*; and especially, as to the Augmentation of Christ's natural Body, to be *assez bizarre* ||;) and lest he should make it liable to so many odious absurdities, as that a *Transubstantiation*, which he endeavours to avoid, may seem much the more plausible, and eligible of the two, perhaps; I say, for these considerations, he undertakes to qualify, and render a credible and likely sense to, it on this manner: In saying, 1. That they hold indeed an *Union* of the *Divinity* to the Bread, and that in an higher manner, than to any other Sacred Sign, or Ceremony; but yet not *Hypostatical*. 2. That they hold the Bread changed into an augmentative part of Christ's natural Body; but, it remaining still *entire* Bread as before, and altered only in a *Supernatural Virtue*, added to it. 3. Hold it to be joined to Christ's Body, and augmenting it; but so, as to be not *individually* the same, but *numerically* distinct from it, as also those new parts we receive by nourishment, are distinct from all the former parts of our Body. 4. To be joined to this natural Body of Christ, not locally, or to it as present in the Eucharist; but, as in Heaven. How this? As, saith he, a Mystery may be said to be an *Appendix*, or Accessory, to the thing, of which it is a Mystery. And, to these four Qualifications this Author seems necessitated; because, otherwise, *Adoration, and Transubstantiation, in some part, though not a total; Existence of the Accidents without a Subject; The same Body at once in many places; and several other Consequents, thus appearing also in the Greek's Opinion, would have given too much countenance to the Roman.*

§. 11.

|| See M.

Claude 2d.

Ans. part.

2. c. 2. p. 249.

|| l. 6. c. 10.

p. 867.

Where you may observe; that there are three things wherein his explaining of this Opinion, he imputes to the *Greeks*, to render it more remote from the *Latins*, falls short of that, which, according to the Comparison, and the expressions, they use, he is justly obliged to maintain. 1. The first, That the *Union* of the *Divinity* to the Consecrated Bread, is *Hypostatical*, or Personal. For such an Union had our Lord's *Divinity* to the *Nourishment*, (to which this is compared) received by him, and added to his natural Body, born of the Blessed Virgin: || And no less Union than this will serve to make the Eucharistical Bread one, and the same, with it (a thing constantly affirmed by the *Greeks*,) at least as to the *Suppositum*; or to make both these the Body of the same Person. The difference of the *Union*, (saith M. Claude ||) is discerned by the difference of the effect it produceth in the things. Now what thing more is requisite to stile it an Union *Hypostatical* (*Hypostasis*, and *Subsistentia*, or *Persona*, with the *Greeks*, importing the same thing,) than this effect, that it renders this Body, to which it unites it self,

Self, and that Body born of the Blessed Virgin, the same Body of one Person: and this Union gives to this new Body, the self-same vivifying virtue, Physically inherent, as it doth to the other *Natural*? And then, such an Hypothetical Union, if granted, will infer the same Dignity of this breaded body with the other: the same Ceremonies of Honour and Adoration due: Things, which this Person is unwilling to hear of; and that would ruine his Cause.

The 2d. That there is a Substantial change of the Bread; i. e. of the substantial form of Bread at least; in that this Bread is truly made the Flesh, and Blood, and animated with the humane Soul, of our Lord, as well as, united to his Divinity: For so the *Nourishment* received by our Lord on Earth, and added to his Body born of the Virgin, remained not, still, Bread; but was truly changed into his *Flesh*; and so also is ours. And the *Expressions* of the *Greeks* are sutable, and cannot, without an unjust force and straining, be otherwise explicated.

To instance in one or two. Such is that of *Theophylact*, in Matt. 26. — *Non enim dixit: Hac est figura; sed Hoc est Corpus meum. Ineffabili enim operatione transformatur, etiamsi nobis videatur Panis, quoniam infirmi sumus & abhorremus crudas carnes comedere, maxime hominis carnem: & ideo Panis quidem apparet, sed revera Caro est.* And in *Mark*. 14. — *Et quomodo, inquit Caro non videtur? Sanguinem propositum, & carnem videntes, non feremus, sed abhorremus. Idcirco misericors Deus, nostra infirmitati condescendens, speciem quidem Panis & Vini servat, in virtutem autem carnis & sanguinis translelementat.* Where, if *Theophylact* had meant by [*Caro vere est.*] *Caro tantum in virtute est*, he would never have given this reason, in his comment on Matt. — *Panis apparet, quod vere est Caro, quoniam infirmi sumus, & abhorremus crudas carnes:* but rather would have removed all difficulty here, and prevented such a Question; *Cur Caro non videtur?* by telling them: *Ut apparet, ita est, Panis: Caro autem est, non vere, aut in substantia, sed tantum in Virtute.* This had been plain dealing: but then he had overthrown his Text: *Hoc est Corpus meum, non figura Corporis mei;* and made it only, (as *M. Claude* doth,) at the most, *Hoc est Efficax figura Corporis mei, non ipsum Corpus.* As for the pains *M. Claude* hath taken || to qualify this *Panis apparet, Caro vere est*, in mingling together *Theophylact's* Comments on *Matthew*, *Mark*, and *John*; and in taking *Speciem Panis* in *S. Mark*, not for the shew, or appearance; but Substance, of Bread (by which it should run, not *vere Caro*, but *vere Panis*, in his Comment on *S. Matt.*) and in understanding *Virtus Carnis* in *S. Mark*, with a *tantum*; (so as this excludes *vere Caro*, in *S. Matt.*) I am confident, that the ingenious Reader will find therein only great industry used to obscure a clear Truth.

For *Virtue* may be used as well augmentatively, as diminutively, in respect of Substance; as including Substance, and adding something to it, and as opposing an outward shew only without Reality, or a Substance without efficacy; as *D. Arnould* || hath judiciously observed; and, for clearing it, instanced in that of *St. Paul* 2 Tim. 3. 5. — *Habentes speciem quidem pietatis, virtutem ejus abnegantes:* and that of *S. Gregory Nyssen*. *Orat.*

Catechet. c. 37. — *Igitur unde in illo corpore* [of our Lord, when here on Earth] *transmutatus Panis transit in Divinam virtutem; per idem* [Verbum] *nunc fit similiter; Nam & illic Gratia Verbi Corpus, cui ex Pane erat substantia & quodammodo ipsum erat Panis, sanctum fecit: & hic* [in the Eucharist] *similiter, Panis, sicut dicit Apostolus, sanctificatur per Verbum Dei, & orationem, non eo quidem, quod, per comestionem & bibitionem in Verbi Corpus evadat; sed quod, statim, per Verbum in Corpus transmutetur, sicut dictum est a Verbo: Hoc est Corpus meum.* And afterwards he saith, —

In illud [Corpus immortale Christi, mentioned before] *trans-elementata eorum, qua apparent, Natura.* Which place, because D. Arnauld much pressed as thoroughly clearing that of *Theophilact*, our Lords Nourishment being changed, as into the vertue, so doubtless also into the Substance of his Body; and because it is that place, from which first Source M. Claude,

|| 1. 3. c. 13. || derives the Modern Greek Opinion, I was curious to search what M. Claude would say to it; but I found him, as to speak to that of S. Paul, and other passages, so, prudently, to pass over this, the most insisted on by his Ad-

|| 2 Resp. part 2. c. 2. || versary, in silence. But who pleaseth may see in another place || (where it is urged against Protestants for Transubstantiation) how miserably this plain passage of this Father suffers under his Exposition of it : Whilst this Expression (*dure & irregulier*, as he calls it) represents nothing else, but *Damascen's* and the Modern Greek Opinion to any one, that hath not shut his eyes, and shews the Modern and Ancient Greek Church to be all of one Faith. Here then you see, in *Greg. Nyssen*, *Virtus includes Substance*; Now see it in that place of *Euthymius* cited before †, added to Substance, as being indeed the main thing to be insisted on. —

Hac ineffabiliter (saith he) *transmutat in ipsum vivificum Corpus, & in ipsum pretiosum sanguinem suum, & in Grati- am* [or virtutem, or vim] *eorum*: which Grace he explains presently after, by this Body strengthening us as Bread doth; and this Blood exhilarating us, as Wine ||. And see in *Theophylact's* Comment on *John 6.* the like addition. — *Panis*, (saith he, speaking of our Lords nourishment,) *in Corpus ejus mutabatur* [there is the change of the Substance]. — *Et in augmentum & sustentamentum conferebat*, [there is the Vertue]. Again,

Ita & nunc Panis in Carnem Domini mutatur [there is the Substance;] *Nec nudi hominis Caro est, sed Dei, & qua deificare valet* [there is the Vertue]. Now, *Virtus* taken thus in *Theophylact*, all things in him agree well together: Thus, it suits well with, *vere Caro est*: — with, *Ineffabilis Operatio*; Language not so usual for a change of vertue only; — With the Question, *Cur non videtur Caro?* weakly asked, if *Theophylact* spake only of a change of Vertue, and not Substance too; and if this then the known common Doctrine; — With this Answer to the Question; which as I have shewed, in case he held a presence of Vertue only, ought to have been quite another; and such as a Protestant now would give. Lastly, it suits well with his former arguing. — *Non enim Dixit; Hoc est Figura Corporis, sed, Hoc est Corpus*, (which, if good, must hold as well of *virtus*, or of any thing else, that is not *ipsum Corpus*). But Vertue taken so exclusively, overturns all; and makes *Theophylact* contradict himself, that he may not, M. Claude. Thus much in vindication of the true sense of *Vertue*, when used by the Greek Authors.]

A like

|| See *Psal.*
103. 15.

† §. 6.

A like passage to this in *Theophylact*, see in *Remigius Antisidor*: in *Expos. Missæ*, a follower, as *M. Claude* grants || of the Opinion of *Damasen*, and the || l. 6. c. 10. Greeks. — *Cum Myſterium ſit* (ſaith he) *quod aliud ſignificat, Si* [Eu- p. 862. *chariſtia*] *in veritate Corpus Chriſti eſt, quare appellatur myſterium? Propterea utique; quia poſt Conſecrationem aliud eſt, aliud videtur. Videtur ſiquidem Panis & Vinum; ſed in veritate Corpus Chriſti eſt & Sanguis. Conſulens ergo omnipotens Deus infirmitati noſtra, qui uſum non habemus comedere Carnem crudam & Sanguinem bibere, facit, ut in priſtina remaneant forma illa duo munera, eſſi, in veritate, Corpus Chriſti & Sanguis, ſicut ipſe dixit, &c.* Where *Priſtina forma* cannot be extended to the internal ſubſtantial Form or Eſſence of Bread ſtill remaining, as *M. Claude* || would divert the ſenſe; For this internal Form or Eſſence, either in the Bread, or Fleſh, ſince not ſeen, neither cauſeth, nor removeth Horror; and the maintaining of this Form ſutes not with the *In veritate Chriſti Corpus eſt*; and *verè Caro eſt*, in theſe Authors; which expreſſions do imply, *In veritate*, not *Panis*; but is to be underſtood only of the external form, and other qualities thereof, occuring to ſenſe, the ſight, taſte, &c. For, ſo that the Eucharift hath all theſe exterior qualities of Bread, where we do not ſee, or taſte, we dread not, crude Fleſh; and the horror, we have, is from its appearing, not from its being, Fleſh. Now this, [*Panis quidem apparet: Caro verè eſt,*] of the Greeks, what is it, but ſaying the ſame thing with that of the *Latins*. — *Subſtantia Panis mutatur in Carnem, licet remaneant adhuc accidentia Panis, quæ ſub ſenſum cadunt.* And hence, when, upon an unuſual expreſſion happening in the Council at *Conſtantinople* under *Conſtantinus Copronymus*, [that the only Image adorable, was the *ἡμῶν ἀειδύς* Corporis Chriſti in the Holy Sacrament] the Real and corporal preſence from a jealouſie, (though cauſeleſs as this Council explained it ſelf) that this expreſſion might vary, or derogate ſomething from it, began now to be more particularly inſiſted upon and explicated, a curious Queſtion aroſe among the *Greeks*, as well as *Latins*: Whether, upon the Bread being thus changed, and becoming our Lord's Body, the Body of our Lord were digeſtible, and corruptible? which cauſed to ſome, affirming it, the imputation of *Stercorariſm*. But ſuch odious name, ſurely, theſe could never have incurred, no more than now *Proteſtants* do, had they held, (at leaſt, as the oppoſite party underſtood them) only a vivifying vertue of our Lords Body to reſide in the Bread, and not the very Subſtance of his Body to be preſent inſtead of it, according to the then common Opinion.

This of the 2d. thing, wherein *M. Claude*'s explication is deficient; the change the *Greeks* held of the Bread, into the Subſtance of our Lord's Body, at leaſt ſo far, as our Nouriſhment is, into the Subſtance of ours, the principal reaſon of their uſing this ſimilitude; Yet, wherein *M. Claude* deſerts it, though, in ſome other things, more advantagious to him, (as in the matter of the nouriſhment ſtill remaining, and that numerically diſtinct from the Body nouriſhed,) he preſſeth it too far. Now this 2d. thing, [the Bread in the Eucharift its receiving ſuch a change, as our Nouriſhment,] once granted, will be at leaſt an half-*Transubſtantiation* of it; the

Sub-

Substantial Form of Bread being gone; the former Qualities of Bread gone, viz. from their any longer inherence in the Bread; So that the Substance, not of Bread, but of Flesh, is also under the former Accidents of the Bread; The name also gone with the thing; it being in truth now no more to be called Bread, but the *Flesh* of our Lord. And so, when the Bread is said by S. *Damasen*, to be united to the Divinity, it must be understood so, as that, in the Union, it becomes another thing; though still it remains a *diverse* thing from the Divinity. Hence also the pretence of the Bread its being made our Lord's Body only in *Vertue*, not in *Substance*, gone; and all M. *Claude's* quest after this word *Vertue* in the *Greek* Authors useless, and his Descants upon it unsound: of which enough hath been said already, §. 6.

§. 13.

The 3d. (If we may prosecute their *similitude* of nourishment to its utmost extent.) That there is a local Union of the Bread and Body of our Lord; not, by way of Accumulation, and Addition: or of Continuation only; as a Leg and an Arm are joined in the same Body; but by way of an interior reception one into the other, and the most intimate commixtion and confusion of them, as to the least natural parts, that are dividible, and capable of digestion, one within the other: So as the least part of one cannot be severed from the other, or communicated without the other; and, as to any actual separation of them, (a thing not fecible,) they may be said to be *numerically* the same; which comes also the nearest to a total transition, even of its *matter* also, into another Substance; though, as to this total Conversion, we must permit the operation of Gods Omnipotency (out of his infinite kindness to us) in the Holy Eucharist to stand singular, and unparallel'd by any work of Nature.

All these three therefore the Author, in dealing ingenuously with the *Greeks* Comparison, and their Expressions, as it seems to me, ought to have allowed. But this, probably, he much dreaded; as seeing he might as well, nay in some respects better, have admitted a total *Transubstantiation* of Matter as well as Form; which would have avoided those many prejudices and indignities, which an *Impanation* labours under. But yet thus the Sentiment of the *Greeks*, supposing no total Conversion, is advanced far beyond not only M. *Claude's*, and the *Calvinists*, *virtual presence*, but also the *Lutherans* *Consubstantiation*. For, whereas these hold only Bread, and Christs natural Body joined in the Eucharist, so that the Body and the Bread are two several things still, this Opinion holds the one changed into the other so, as that, as *Jeremy* the Patriarch of *Constantinople*, replied upon the *Lutherans* in his second Answer || (and as *Damasen* also said long before. ||) || c. 4. — *Non duo jam sunt* [i. e. as the *Lutherans* said, *Panis*, and *Corpus Christi*, joined,] *sed unum, & idem*, [i. e. *Corpus Christi* only]. The Bread made his natural Flesh; animated with his Soul; Hypostatically united to his Divinity: in fine, the same with his Body, as much at least as our Nourishment, interiorly received, and digested is with ours.

§. 14.

Thus far the *Greeks* usual *Simile* carries us. But their Common Doctrine farther, even to a total *Transubstantiation*, as I think will appear from what follows.

I. For,

1. For, 1st. They hold; that the same *Numerical* Body of our Lord, that was born of the Virgin, and Crucified, is exhibited to us in the Eucharist: Present, not by his descending from Heaven; but, by the Conversion of the Consecrated Elements into the self-same Body, and by the multiplication of its *local Existence* in more places, than before.

1. Which appears; 1st. From this; That the Identity of the Body Consecrated, and that Crucified, *quoad suppositum*, or as both united to, and filled with, the same Divinity, (which well consists with a Real, Substantial, Numerical, diversity between themselves,) is not sufficient, that the one of them, therefore, may be denominated of the other; or this said to be that; nor yet sufficient, that *all* the same things may be said of them both. Some *general* things indeed may be predicated of them, wherein both agree; but their Properties *individual*, as *local presence*, *Motion*, any *particular* Qualities or applications of them cannot: (Yet which *Individual* properties are usually applied by the *Greeks* to the Body Crucified, and to that distributed in the Eucharist, as one, and the same.) Any Individual Properties of the one or the other, I grant, may always be truly denominated of our Lord's Body in *general*, as we will; But cannot be truly said of both, or either of *these*, the *Consecrated*, and the *Crucified*, as we please, if these not numerically the same. So we cannot say, That ones Soul is his Body; or a Leg, an Arm; or, the one in the same place, or motion, or every way affected, as the other is, because that both are parts of one and the same Person, or Body, and both animated with one and the same Soul. And, for a *Grecian Priest* to tell his Communicants, that he delivers them the same Body that was Crucified and offered for their Salvation, and Redemption, (when he gives them neither it, nor any part of it,) because he gives them another Augmentative Broaden part, belonging to the same Person, which Person indeed was Crucified for them, seems too bold an Equivocation to be, by this Person, so confidently imposed on the *Greek Church*, and their ordinary expressions. The *Truth* therefore of that, which the *Greeks*, or other *Latins*, embracing their Opinion, do affirm; viz. that the Eucharist, Consecrated in never so many places, are all the self-same Body, one with another; and all, with the Crucified; because replenished every where with the same *Divinity*, must be understood to proceed, not from the meer Union, or Conjunction, how intimate soever, of these two (as is shewed but now:) but to proceed from the effect (as M. Claude, pressed with his Adversary's Arguments, confesseth) from the effect, I say, which this Divinity, first uniting, or conjoining it self to the Elements upon the words of Consecration, worketh in them to make them, by a total Transmutation of their Substance, (for nothing less can do it) individually all one, and the same, with one another, and with that Crucified; after which follows another, an *Hypostatical Union* of the same Divinity to them, as made our Lord's Body.

2. Again: Their holding a *Numerical* Identity every where of this Body of our Lord appears from this; that they explain its being, in all places, but one; and in every place, and in every Particle whole and intire, by the

the Divinity's being so; and the Divinity is so, numerically. See that passage of *Remigius*, and *Aluin*, (cited by *M. Claude*, l. 6. c. 10.) concerning the effect of this repletion of the Consecrated Elements by the Divinity.

— *Sicut Divinitas Verbi Dei una est*, [una numero] *qua totum implet mundum*; Ita licet multis locis, & innumerabilibus diebus, illud Corpus consecratur, non sunt tamen multa corpora Christi, neque multi Calices; sed unum Corpus Christi, & unus Sanguis cum eo quod sumpsit in utero Virginis & quod dedit Apostolis. Divinitas enim verbi replet illud quod ubique est, [the Bread] & conjungit, ac facit [by a transmutation of this Bread by the Divinity joined to it,] ut, sicut ipsa [Divinitas, quæ totum implet mundum, tamen] una est, ita [quod ubique est, or Panis] coniungatur [i. e. by such a transmutation of it] Corpori Christi, & unum corpus ejus sit in veritate. [i. e. one not only as to the Person, but one in Reality and Essence, as the Divinity is one; and otherwise, that, which follows, and which he collects from this Unity, cannot be true]. Unde animadvertendum est, quod sive plus sive minus quis inde percipiat, omnes aequaliter Corpus Christi integerrime sumunt, & generaliter omnes, & specialiter unusquisque. Certainly, where the whole is in every part, and every part (if I may so say) contains in it the whole, here is supposed a numerical Identity, and a sicut Divinitas una est. Nor hath *M. Claude*, in his holding the Substance of the Eucharist, in several places, really diverse, and so, to each Communicant, any way to relieve himself in answer to such expressions, necessarily inferring a total Transubstantiation, but by inducing his virtual presence only, which *Vertue* he saith is every where numerically the same; and whole, and entire, to every Receiver. This for *Remigius*.

And here also, if we may make use of a Negative Argument (which is sometimes very weak, sometimes very strong, and convincing, according to the circumstances, which must be left to the prudent to consider,) whereas the Greek Doctors, had they declared the Body of our Lord, that is distributed in the Eucharist, to be really diverse from that on the Cross; and when Consecrated in several places diverse one from another, (a necessary consequent, as *M. Claude* saith, of their Tenent,) might have rendered this Mystery much more easie, and intelligible; Yet they have never mentioned any such diversity; but still, as it were to prevent and strangle any such fancy, cautiously added, and it is one and the same with that which was born, and dyed for us; And, for this numerical Identity, urge our Lords own words †, — *Hoc est illud, quod tradetur*, that Flesh of his, that was to be Crucified; and so for his Blood, *qui effundetur*, that was to be shed on the Cross. As if our Lord would make this for ever a firm Article of our Faith, and prevent all such Equivocation, as *eadem caro quoad suppositum, or personam*. And, upon this supposition of the same numerical Body here present, the Greeks (mistaking the sense of it) censure the expression of the Latins in their Canon. — *Jube hac preferri per manus sancti Angeli tui in supercaleste Altare tuum, &c.* as incongruous, if pronounced after the Consecration once ended. For so, saith *Cabasilas* †, *Quomodo fuerit, si nondum*

† Liturg. expof. c. 30. est, supercaleste ipsum Corpus Christi, quod est supercaleste? Quomodo sursum ferretur

retur in manu Angelis, quod supra omnem Principatum? &c. [that is above, already]. But this *Quomodo* might soon have been answered by himself, if he held this Consecrated here a new body, really distinct from that above. This, of the 1st. proof of a *Total Transubstantiation*, the *Greeks* holding the Eucharist the same numerical body with that Crucified; which, according to M. Claude, necessarily infers a *Total Transubstantiation* of the Bread, as well for its Matter, as Form.

2ly. They hold the *Body*, that is thus present by Consecration, to be incorruptible; and this *Incorruption* of it to depend on its *Resurrection*, and so, to relate, only, to that numerical Body that was Crucified, and Raised from Death. — *Quod nec laeditur, nec corrumpitur, nec in secessum abit: Hoc avertat Deus*, saith *Damascen*: and therefore the *Greeks*, who are said generally to follow his Opinion, must, in Justice, be freed from *Stercoranism*. Now the *Bread*, remaining entire for its whole Substance, or for its Matter and Qualities at least, as before Consecration, cannot be held such a Body of our Lord, as suffers no digestion, or corruption. For, something there is in the Sacrament, that suffers this: And we cannot imagine, that the *Greeks*, whilst holding the Substance of Bread to remain, will lay these changes only upon the *Species*, or *Accidents* of it; and not the Substance at all; so that, though they eat the Bread, they taste, and are fed only by the *Accidents*; and so, without a *Transubstantiation*, will espouse the difficulties of it. Their holding, then, the Body, that is present, and participated in the Eucharist, to be incorruptible, excludes the Substance, or matter, of Bread from this Body. And, — *Panis quidem videtur*, or, *apparet, sed revera Caro est*: as *Theophilact*. † — *Corpus Christi non particulatim diducitur, &c.* — *Partitio est accidentium, sub sensum cadentium*; as *Samenas*: || — *Non Panis, sed Corpus Domini sacrificatur*: — and — *Si Panis manens, sacrificatus fuisset, Saraceno. Panis esset sacrificium, non Agni Dei*: as *Cabasilas*: || must all be understood of an entire change of the Bread, as well its Matter as Form.

§. 15.

In Mat. 26.
Dialog. cum
Saraceno.
Liturg. ex-
positio. c. 32.

3ly. They hold this Body, that is present, and distributed in the Eucharist, to remain, — *quoties frangitur, totum, & integrum in unoquoque frusto*: And, — *Omnibus distributum, minime diminutum*. — *Frangitur Agnus Dei, & non comminuitur; semper comeditur, & non consumitur*; saith their *Liturgy* ||. Not a several piece, or part of our Lord's Body received in the several Particles, but all: Nor, those receiving more of this Body, that receive more of the *Symbole*: In infinite places offered only the same Sacrifice viz. that one which was offered on the Cross to several Communicants distributed the self same Body; and: It to each entire; A Tenent flowing from the former, Its *incorruptibility* (and by all the same persons maintained). For, what is so, is no more capable of being parted, or divided, &c. Now these things cannot sute to our Lord's Body, if the matter of Bread be said, still to remain, and to make up an augmentative part of our Lord's natural Body, but this numerically and really distinct from it. For so, in several places will be offered Sacrifices, but these really different from one another, as also from that of the Cross: Nor will the Communicants receive our Lord's Body entire, but each apart; and this part numerically differing from that Body,

§. 16.

Missa.
Chrysostom.

pus, quod traditum est (which Communion of a parcel was a thing objected to the *Sacerdotes*; and those, who held our Lord's Body corruptible.) See M. Claude's Concessions concerning this, 2d. Answer part 3. c. 2. and so his retreat to a *Virtual presence*, to verify these expressions of the *Greeks*, of this Body every where the same, and received by every one entire.

§. 17.

As for some speeches used by the *Greeks*, in making application of their Similitudes, (none of which can exactly fit so high a Mystery,) that seem not to accord so well with a Total Transubstantiation. — *The Bread said by them to be assumed by, or united to, the Divinity of our Lord: — The Bread, and his Body by the Divinity, to be made One: — An Augmentation of Christ's Body to be made by the Bread consecrated, as, here on Earth, by his Nourishment, &c.* I see no Reason, why this Person should not be contented with the former Explications given of them; Such, as 1. both free these Authors from contradicting themselves; and 2. do render the sense of the *Fathers* unanimous, and the Christian Doctrine to run all in one common Stream; [viz. the Real Presence, and Exhibition, in the Eucharist, of that numerical Body that suffered for us on the Cross;] 3. and whereby also may be avoided those many gross absurdities concerning new Contracts, and Unions, and new Bodys of our Lord, which, being so unworthy these high Mysteries, and very injurious to our Lord's Incarnation, are all avoided by a total Transubstantiation. See, if you please, these absurdities mentioned by Bellarmine *De Euchar.* l. 3. c. 13. & 15. and by Suarez. *De Sacrament. Disp.* 49. §. 3. The Divinity of our Lord, then, may be said to assume, or unite it self unto the Bread; or, to make the Bread one with his Body, not by a meer joining it to Himself, or to his Body, whilst it remains still Bread; but, by this first converting and changing of it, by his Divine Omnipotency, into his Body, and then, his uniting, Hypostatically, his Divinity to it. And, his Body may be said in some sort to receive daily an Augmentation from these iterated Consecrations of Bread to be made his Body, in as much as there is a daily multiplication of his Body, as to its local Existence in more places than before, according to the frequency of Communion; whilst his Body, in Heaven, doth not descend, but keeps its constant former residence there.

§. 18.

Thus *Greeks* and *Larins*, former and latter times, will be at some accord. Whereas this Author, to maintain a variance between the two Churches, seems necessitated to fasten on the *Greeks* an Opinion, which being taken in its just extent, Transubstantiation seems much the more eligible; and which he is forced many times also to pare, and qualify so, that it may have some Conformity to the Doctrine of *Protestants*, and keep a greater distance from the *Roman*, as offers extreme violence to the natural sense of their words. For Example. He allows, * an Union of the Divinity to our Lord's Body in the Eucharist, as the *Greeks* say; But no such Union Hypostatical. * Christ's body in the Eucharist the same with that born of the Blessed Virgin, as they say; but in such a sense as mean-while to remain really, essentially, numerically, diverse from it. * The Bread, the same body with that born of the Virgin; but, It not changed into Christ's Flesh, but remaining still Bread. * Bread still, not only for the matter; as it was in our Lord's, or is in our, nourish-

rishment; but, for the same Substantial Form, and Qualities, still inhering in it, as before. * The Bread made the *very*, and true, body, as they say; But *virtually* only, in having infused into it, and inherent in it, the vivifying virtue of Christs natural Body: (Where the *Protestants* leave the *Greeks* to stand by themselves; allowing this Vertue communicated to the *Believer* only, not to the *Symbols*.) * The Eucharistical body conjoined (as our nourishment is to ours,) to Christs natural body, as they say, but the one only in *Heaven*, the other on *Earth*. * Our Lord's Body in the Eucharist, by the same Divinity inhabiting in both, made one and the same with that born of the Virgin, as they say; but *Mystically* and *Sacramentally* only. For, the same Divinity, replenishing both, doth not, therefore, render them really the same one with another. * The same body thus with that; but no *Sovereign Adoration* due, or by the *Greeks* given, to this, as to that. * This the same Body with that; and this also, as indivisible, received entire by every Communicant, as the *Greeks* say; but this Body entire, in vertue only, not in Substance. * The same Body of our Lord in all places, where this Sacrament is celebrated; but only in the former sense; *i. e.* the vertue and the efficacy of it, the same. If such be their sense, the Reader cannot but think the *Greeks* very unfortunate in their Expressions; or, if not their sense, this person presuming, he should meet with very credulous Readers. This (from n. 11.) of the 8th. Observation, M. *Claude's* explication of the *true Opinion of the Modern Greeks*; and the necessary *consequents* of it.

gly. After this, He confesseth; That it doth not appear, that the *Greeks* §. 19. have made any Opposition to the *Roman Church* about *Transubstantiation*, l. 4. c. 5. p. 390. — In a word, saith he, the *Greeks* neither believe, nor impugne, *Transubstantiation*. They believe it not; for it hath no place in the *Doctrine of their Church*. It is neither in the *Confessions of their Faith*; nor *Decisions of Councils*, nor *Liturgies*; [*i. e.* in such Language, as he exacts. Surely, this main Point, the Manner of our Lords Presence, is not omitted in all these: the *Constantinopolitan*, the second *Nicene*, Council, the *Liturgies* speak of it; Nor is *Transubstantiation* impugned in them, according to him: is clearly maintained by them, according to *Catholicks*.] They do not impugne it; For, as far as appears, they have not argued with the *Latins*, nor formally debated it with them in their former *Disputes*. Thus He. And, as he grants the *Greeks* not to have quarrelled with the *Latins*, because they held *Transubstantiation*. So † the *Latins* never to have accused the *Greeks*, as if they held it not. There seems therefore no great need of *Missions*, distributing *charities*, teaching *Schools* there, &c. to induce these *Oriental*s to approve a Tenent, which they never formerly contested; and of an error in which, though the main Point, these two Churches never accused one another: Nay, the *Greeks*, in some of their *Confessions*, as in that of the *Venetian Greeks* to the Cardinal of *Guisse*, seem to have out-done the *Latins*; and to go beyond *Transubstantiation*. || p. 375.

Mean-while; the great quarrels the same *Greeks* make with the *Latins*, about smaller matters in this principal part of the Christian Service, and the chief Substance of its *Liturgies*, the Eucharist, as about the manner of

the Consecration; and about *Azymes*; and on the other side, the great Storms, that have been raised between *Catholicks* and *Protestants*, from the very beginning of the Reformation, about this very Point of *Transubstantiation*, do shew, that, if the difference between the *Greeks* and *Latins* were considerable and real herein, there could not have been, on both sides such a constant silence; Though in some other matters, of little consequence, or, at least, of little evidence, such as M. Claude instanceth in, there can be shewed a silent toleration of the different Judgments, as well of Churches, as of private Persons.

§. 20.

1oly. Hitherto, from §. 9. I have reflected on M. Claude's Explication of the *Greeks* Opinion concerning *Transubstantiation*. Now to view the other Point, *Adoration*. Here 1st. He denies not an inferior and Relative Adoration to be allowed to be due, and paid by the *Greeks*, to the Holy Mysteries in the *Eucharist*; such as is given to the *Holy Gospel*, and to other Sacred things. Of which we find in S. Chrysostom's *Mass*, that, before his reading the Gospel, — *Diaconus responder. Amen. & reverentiam Sancto Evangelio exhibet.* See M. Claude's last Answer, l. 3. c. 7. p. 219. where he grants; *That the Greeks have much Devotion for Pictures; for the Evangile, and for the pain benit; and for the Bread of the Eucharist, before the Consecration.* 2ly. A Supreme Adoration he grants lawful, and due to our Lord's Humanity where-ever present; and allows such an Adoration actually given, even by *Protestants*, at the time of their receiving the *Eucharist*, to our Lord Christ, and to his Sacred Humanity, as in Heaven. And, to his Adversary urging some places of the *Fathers* for the practice of Adoration in the Communion, he replies. — || *The Author deceives us, in proving what is not controverted. For the Question is, not: whether in the Communion we ought to adore Jesus Christ our Redeemer, and his Flesh personally united to the Word, represented by the Sacrament: We practice it with an ardent, and humble Devotion, when we approach to the Holy Table. And afterward, — Who doubts, but that the Body of Jesus Christ is Sovereignly Adorable.* 3ly. He cannot but know, or else hath been very careless to inform himself; that no *Sovereign Adoration*, is pretended either by the *Roman*, or *Greek Church* to be given to the external *Species*, or *Symbols*, of the *Eucharist*, (which they hold Venerable only with an inferior cult, such as is due to all other Holy things,) but only to the *Body* and *Blood* of *Christ* contained under them; as the Council of *Trent*, allowing the Expression of adoring the Sacrament, cultu *Latria*, yet explains it in their Canon thus. † — *Si quis dixerit in Sancto Eucharistia Sacramento Christum, unigenitum Dei Filium, non esse cultu Latria etiam externo adorandum, Anathema sit:* And, as *Bellarmin* † also resolves the state of the Controversie. — *Quicquid sit de modo loquendi; status questionis non est, nisi An Christus in Eucharistia sit adorandus cultu Latria.* 4ly. In the Fourth Observation precedent, M. Claude saith he will not contest the *Greeks* holding a *Real Presence* of our Lord in the *Eucharist*, Though, he contends, it is not by the *Roman* way of *Transubstantiation*. Now from this *Real Presence* held by the *Greeks* even after that way he allows, at least, if he will but grant the true consequences thereof, mentioned before, §. 11. viz. An

Hypo-

|| 2 Resp.
part. 2. c. 8.
p. 416.

† Seff. 13. c. 6

† De Eucha.
l. 4. c. 29.

Hypostatical, or other, Union to this Body offered and distributed in the Eucharist, such as converts it into the Flesh of our Lord, and renders it the Body of the same Person, with that born of the Blessed Virgin; *non aliud ab eo, quod sumpsit in utero Virginis*; (by which the People seem sufficiently instructed not to distinguish, in their Mode of Adoration, between these two, that they are taught to be personally the same.) I say from such a *Real Presence* held by the *Greeks* a lawfulness of adoring Christ's Body, as there present, must be held by them. And then; if it can be shewed by M. Claude they do not actually adore, it must be reckoned a matter of neglect; not, of Conscience, or denying such thing due.

5ly. But, now, to consider their *Practice*. He denies not the *Greeks* to adore, in their Mode of Adoration, (which is by inclining the *Head* and *Body*; seldom, *kneeling*;) when they receive the Communion; their *Liturgies* have it, often repeated; and, surely, he will allow them, herein, as much Devotion as he doth to the *Protestants*: and also them, to give at least an external *Relative Devotion* to the *Mysteries*, for such they give to the *Evangelists*: and, methinks, the witnesses he produceth, p. 216. should not, in general, deny simply, any Adoration of the *Greeks* at all. The Question, then, only is; granting already an external Adoration given by the *Greeks*, when they approach to the Communion; whether this, in their intention, be a *sovereign* Adoration exhibited to Christ's Sacred Divinity and Humanity, as there present, Now; the *Greeks* holding this Humanity there really present, conceded before, seems sufficient to determine this, without more ado. And, for one to pretend, that this Adoration of the *Greeks* is given only to God; or to Christ's Divinity as every where present; or, to the Humanity united to it, but only to this as in *Heaven*; and, not to it also as present in the Eucharist, when the same *Greeks* confess it to be so; and, when the Eucharistical presence is the occasion of such their Adoration; here I say, not to allow the extent of their Adoration, so far as they believe the presence of the Person adored; and their worship the same latitude, as their Faith, would be an unjust and groundless abridgment of their Devotions: as also this, to pretend an *inferior*, or *relative*, Adoration given by them only to the *Mysteries*, where the same Communicants hold a *supreme* due to the Person present with them.

To view a little the Form of their *Liturgy*. We read in St. Chrysostom's *Mass*: That the Priest, after Consecration and before he takes the Holy Bread to communicate himself with it, adores: and saith, — *Attende, Domine Jesu Christe, de sancto habitaculo tuo: veni ad sanctificandum nos qui in excelsis cum Patre simul resides, & hic una nobiscum invisibiliter versaris; & dignare potenti manu tua nobis impertiri immaculatum Corpus tuum, & pretiosum sanguinem; & per nos, toti Populo. Corpus tuum*, I add, never severed from thy Divinity, and thy self. To whom also the Priest had said before in the beginning of the Service. — *Tu enim es, qui offers & offerris; assumis, & distribueris, Christe Deus noster*. Then the Priest adores again, and saith thrice to himself, — *Deus propitius esto mihi Peccatori*; An Act of *Humiliation* used here by him, before he takes the *Sancta* into his hands for the Communion, as it was once before, at the beginning of the Oblation. And so, saith the Rubrick, all the People adore with him. — Po-

pulus

pulus similiter cunctus cum devotione adorat. Then he takes the *Holy Bread*, and makes the *Elevation* of it, yet whole and entire; saying, *Sancta Sanctis*; And the Quire answers, it seems, with relation to It, yet one, and entire, — *Unus Sanctus, Unus Dominus, Jesus Christus.* Then the Priest, breaking it into four Pieces, saith, — *Frangitur Agnus Dei; qui frangitur, at non comminuitur: qui semper comeditur, & non consumitur*; [which shews, what *Agnus Dei*, whether this in Heaven, or present here, is now spoken of, and thus adored.] *Sed eos, qui sunt participes, sanctificat.* So taking a piece thereof in his hand, and preparing himself to receive it, he saith, — *Credo Domine & confiteor, Quod Tu es Christus, &c.* — *Dignare in praecepto anima mea ἀλλογῶ, & in coinquinatum meum Corpus ingredi, & dignare me participem effici sanctissimi tui Corporis & Sanguinis.* [I add, never severed from thy Divinity, and thy self.] Also, when he calls the Deacon, to communicate him with the Holy Bread: 'tis said, — *Accedens Diaconus Reverentiam exhibet.* And so also before receiving the Chalice. It is said again, — *Diaconus venit, et adorat semel, dicens: Ecce venio ad immortalem Regem, &c.* Where it must be remembered, that the *Greeks* also held, the Body of our Lord that is received in the Eucharist, to be *immortal*, and *incorruptible*. This we find in their *Liturgy*. And, suitable to this, we read, in *Cabasilas* † (expounding the *Liturgy*,) concerning the People before their communicating. — *Ipsi autem* (saith he) *fidem attendentes, et adorant, et benediciunt, et Jesum, qui in eis [donis Sanctificatis] intelligitur, [opposed to videtur] ut Deum, celebrant*; Where M. Claude's note is † 1. that — *Non adorant dona, sed Jesum.* But who saith, that a Sovereign Adoration is due, or given, to the *Dona*? Again, 2. *Jesum*, (saith he) *qui intelligitur, i. e. only, qui representatur in Donis.* But all the former Expressions, implying our Lord's presence, shew their belief to be contrary. *Tu es*, (saith the Priest before) *qui offers, et offerris: assumis et distribueris, Christe Deus noster.* And the People, after this adoring, in their receiving, say, — *Benedictus, qui venit in nomine Domini*; of which, the same *Cabasilas*, — *Tanquam nunc ad eos venientem, et apparentem, Christum benediciunt.* Who also before (c. 24.) intimates the custom of the *Greeks*, in the Service *adorare, et alloqui corpus et sanguinem Domini.* Now I say, All these Passages in the *Greek Liturgy* well considered; Here for one to grant, the *Real and Corporal* Presence of our Lord in his whole person in the Holy Mysteries to be believed by this Priest, Deacon, and other Communicants, and yet to say, their Adoration, and other Addresses and Allocutions are not given and made to him, as there present; but to him, only as in Heaven; or only to his *Divinity* as there, and every where present, abstracted from his *Humanity*, is such a Comment upon this *Liturgy*, as nothing but a strong pre-engagement can force upon any ones judgment.

§. 21.

† l. 3. c. 7.
p. 216.

† c. 24.

The Testimonies, this Author brings, † do accuse the *Greeks* of some neglect in this Duty, but do not shew them to justify it; and these very Persons, that censure such neglect toward the Holy Mysteries after Consecrated, accuse them almost of committing Idolatry toward them before. So that it seems rather some defect, of knowledge, in such, concerning the Ceremonies of Consecration, than want of Devotion. *Cabasilas* †, long ago, observed the same in some ignorant People, and blamed it: but yet, in the same place, allows the Adoration of, and Allocutions made to, the Body and Blood of our Lord, when the Offerings

Offerings, are Sacrificed, and perfected: The Consecration also of the *Greeks* being longer extended, and the Adoration not so unitedly performed presently upon the pronouncing of our Lords words of Institution, as amongst the *Latins*; but, disjunctively, at their communicating, might occasion some mistake in those *Latins*, who accused them of a Non-Adoration. So, the other irreverences and indecencies, objected, are to be esteemed only negligences in private practice; not, consequences of the publick Doctrine; nor countenanced by their *Liturgies*. Which *Liturgies* use as much Ceremony towards the Holy Mysteries, as the *Roman* doth; Where also, first, the Remains of the *Holy Bread* are carefully put into the Chalice, for the People to be communicated therewith; and then, for the *Remains*, after the Communion consummated.

— *Sacerdos* (saith the *Rubrick*) *quod residuum est Communions in Sancto Calice, cum attentione, et devotione consumit, et ter Sanctam Calicem abluit, et attendit, ne remaneat particula, Margarita vocata* [not the least crumb of the intinct Host].

As for several Devotions and Honours performed to the *Blessed Sacrament*, here in the *West*, (which this person diligently reckons up, much to its praise,) not so in the *East*; (frequently urged by M. *Claude*, as good Arguments of the *Greek Church* not believing *Transubstantiation*, or such a Real Presence, as the *Roman*;) and, in latter times here more, than in the former, 1st. They are held no such necessary circumstances, or consequences, without the which a Real Presence may not be believed, and a due Adoration, (in some convenient manner or other,) practised: 2^{ly}. The occasion of them is well known to have been the *Berengarian*, and many other, Errors concerning the Eucharist: which appeared here in the *West*, but disturbed not the *East*. Which Errors, inferring many *Indignities* and affronts to this richest, and dearest Legacy of our departing Lord, caused the Church to multiply also the external testifications of her *Devotion*, *Gratitude*, and *Reverence*, to it; and God's wisdom, as usually, out of such vilifyings, and disrespects, extracted a greater Honour, as to External Ceremony, to these High Mysteries. So also the many subtle Questions, that have been disculled and itated among the *Latins*, not so much thought on by the *Greeks*, but all shut in a *Quo modo novit Deus*, (another frequent Argument with this Author, of the *Greeks* not believing *Transubstantiation*) acknowledge the same Original, *viz.* the Provocations, Objections, contrary false-positions, of the Heterodox, which forced the Church to descend to the same particulars with them: Nor could she censure these as Errors, without establishing their Contradictories, as *Truth*. This of *Adoration*.

To conclude. The many Concessions of M. *Claude*, and the Consequences §. 22. of them, forementioned, seem to me sufficient, 1st. To dissuade any sober and modest person, who relies not on his own judgment for the controverted sense of Holy Scriptures, but holds it a safer way to conform to that of Church-Authority; to dissuade him, I say, from any such Communion, as he sees, by the former Account, opposed both by the *Latins* and the *Greeks*; *Greeks*, present, or past, as high as *Damascen*, in the eighth age; and may not I say as high as *Gregory Nyssen*, † in the fourth, whilst both these *Latins* and *Greeks* † See before. hold §. 12.

† See the
Guide in
Controversie
Disc. 1.
§. 57, 58.

|| §. 14, &c.

§. 23.

|| §. 321 n. 1.

hold a Real, or Corporal presence of our Lord in the Eucharist, and agree in a literal sense of *Hoc est Corpus meum*. Nor will M. Claude enter with his Adversary into this Controversie. 2. Next; to persuade him, of the two, rather to the Roman Communion: as whose *Transubstantiation*, besides that it hath been established by so many Councils †, is of it self much more credible, and more accommodated to the Scripture-expressions, then I know not what fancied Augmentation of Christ's natural Body, born of the Blessed Virgin, by a new Bredden one assumed in the Eucharist, numerically distinct from the other; yet, by the like assumption, and Union to our Lord's Divinity, rendred personally one and the same Body with it. But how much more will he be confirmed in the same Resolution, if by what hath been said above, || he discerns M. Claude's Relation of the Modern Greek opinion unfound; and that the main Body of them (except perhaps some few *Impanarists*, that have been there, as also in the Western Church) in holding a total substantial change of the Bread, have accorded with the Roman Church.

I hope the Reader will pardon this digression, the rather, because, it serves much to illustrate that, whereof I was discoursing, || That (notwithstanding whatever evidence of Truth,) Answers, and Replies, from Persons ingenious, and pre-engaged, find no end; and that, when *Controversies* are, by one of the contending parties, denied any Decisive Judge, though error may easily be overcome, yet it can hardly be silenced. For as God, for the greater trial of our obedience, hath permitted in the world not only Evil, but very many allurements also, and enticements, to it; so, not only Errors, but many verisimilities, and appearances of Reason, ever ready to support it, with those that do not by Humility attain the illuminations of his Grace. Evidence sufficient God hath left always to clear, and manifest all necessary Truth to those, who are of an obedient Spirit, and willing to learn it: But not sufficient to force (like the *Mathematicks*) the Understandings of the self-confident, and interested to gain-say it; but that they may have some fair colour or other, to oppose to it, and catch the credulous.

|| §. 8.

All which still more infers the great necessity of Church-Authority, and a conformity to it, and the reasonableness of Monsieur Maimbourg's Method for reducing Protestants to the true Faith, viz. || That matters, once decided by this Authority, should be no longer disputed; A Rule, the Protestants, i. e. the more potent Party of them, for preserving their own peace, would have to be observed in the Differences among themselves, (shewed in the proceedings of the Synod at Dort, of which see before, §. 254. n. 2.) but not, in those between them and Roman Catholics, because here they are the weaker. To whom M. Claude's answer in the Preface of his last Reply to D. Arnauld, is this. --- It is unjust (saith he) that he will have the Decisions of Councils to be Prescriptions against us [the Protestants;] not remembering that nothing can prescribe against Truth, especially when it concerns our Salvation. And, the Determinations of Councils not being with us of any Consideration; but as they do conform to the Holy Scriptures, and to the Principles of Christian Religion, we cannot have from hence any reasonable or profitable way, to end the particular differences that divide us, but only this, to examine the matter to the bottom, to discern whether such conformity
[i. e.

[i. e. of the Councils to the Scriptures,] *which we suppose necessary, is; or, is not.*

To which he adds there, as also frequently elsewhere: That the shortest, and surest, and only right, way for settling the Conscience in repose, (which must rest its Faith immediately on God's Word and Divine Revelation,) is, for both Parties to proceed to the Trial of their cause, all other Authority and Methods laid aside, by the *Holy Scriptures*. And, when he is pressed by his Adversary; That, in these Controversies, at least all persons doubting, i. e. what is the true sense, of the *Scriptures* controverted, and of *Antiquity* expounding them, and not certain of the contrary of what the Church teacheth concerning them, (as all *unlearned* Protestants must be,) ought, herein, to conform, and adhere rather to the *Church*, than to *Separatists*, he seeks to decline it thus: That the simplest person may receive sufficient certainty from the *clearness* of *Scripture*, in all matters *necessary*; that, from these *Scriptures* learning *what he ought to believe*, he may easily know also, whether the *society*, he lives in, be a true Church, and such as will conduct him to *Salvation*, that hence he needs not trouble himself with Controversie, touching what the *former Church* hath believed; Yet that, our Lord promising to be with true Believers to the end of the World, so as they shall not fall into damnable error, Charity obligeth him, (without his reading them,) to believe, that the *Fathers* are of this number; and so, that they believed, as they ought; and so, were of his Faith. To give you his own words, l. i. c. 4. — *The word of God, (saith he) contains purely, and clearly, all that, which is necessary to form our Faith, to regulate our Worship, and Manners. And, God assisting us with his Grace, it is easie for the most simple to judge, whether the Ministry, under which we live, can conduct us to salvation: and consequently, whether our society is a true Church. For, for this, he needs only examine It as to these two Characters. One, if they teach all the things clearly contained in God's word; and the other, if they reach nothing, besides, that is contrary to those things, or doth corrupt the efficacy, and force of them. And afterward, — This Examen, (saith he) is short, easie, and proportion'd to the capacity of all the world: and, it forms a judgment as certain, as if one had discussed all the Controversies one after another. Again, l. i. c. 5. — There are two Questions: One, touching what we ought to believe on the matter of the Eucharist. The other, touching what hath been believed by the ancient Church; The first of these cleared, we need not trouble our selves about the second. Now, as for those of our Communion, the first Question is cleared by the Word of God. And for the second, he resolves it thus, l. i. c. 6. — That the Promises of Jesus Christ assure us, that he will be with true Believers to the end of the world. Whence he concludes, — that there hath always been a number of true Believers, whose Faith hath never been corrupted by damnable Errors. Then, — that charity obligeth us to believe, that the Fathers were of this number. And then lastly, We knowing from Scripture what we ought to believe in this Point, we also are confirmed, without studying them, that the Fathers believed the same.*

Now to reflect briefly on what he hath said in the order it lies here. *A Council (saith he) cannot prescribe against Truth. True; But the Council is brought in for a Judge, where a Dispute and Question is, what, or, on what*

E

side,

side, is the *Truth*. The determinations of Councils are not with us of any consideration, but as they do conform to the *Holy Scriptures*. Right; But, the Council, is called in for a Judge, where a doubt, and dispute is; what, or on what side, is the true sense of such, and such, *Scriptures*. Where, if he meaneth; that they refuse to submit to a Council unless conforming to *Scripture*, as the sense of Scripture is given by the Council, that is it we desire: for the Council will still profess its following the sense of Scripture, if, as this sense is understood by the *Protestants*, what is this, but to say they will submit to the Judgment, or Decision, of a Council, so often as it shall agree with their own? The only reasonable and profitable way to end differences, is this, to examine the matter to the bottom; i. e. whether the Decisions of the Council conform with *Holy Scripture*. But, when this is done, How will the Difference end? Will not the Controversie, as the Replies multiply, swell rather still bigger; as his, and D. Arnauld's doth? Search to the bottom; Suppose a Socinian should say this, against the former Church-decisions, concerning the *Trinity*, the *supreme Deity of the Son*, and *Holy Ghost*; *Gods essential Omnipresence*, his *absolute prescience of future Contingents*, &c. will *Protestants* say, he makes a rational motion? Then, how can any *Protestant* rest his Faith in these Points upon the Authority of the *Councils*, and their *Creeeds*? will you say, he doth not? but, on the *Scriptures*. Have they then searched all these Points to the bottom there; compared the particular *Scriptures* urged by the *Socinian*, and those urged against him; and weighed them in the Ballance? If yet, they have not, ought they? If they ought; what a task here for young *Protestant-students*? what an *Eternal Distraction* in this, [a search:] what heavenly peace, in the other [obedience to the judgments of former Councils;] and Vacancy for better employments! Again, If they ought: what, all *Protestants*? the most of them, as of all *Christians*, are illiterate Men, not having either leisure, or ability, to search, &c. Must these adhere, therefore, to former *Councils*, and their *Creeeds*, in these Points? Then so must they in others; and in this of *Real Presence*, or *Transubstantiation*; and so they remain no longer on M. Claude's party. Or will he bind them to submit their judgment to some inferior Ecclesiastical Authority, or Ministry, standing in opposition to a superior? But this is *Schism* in them both: and justly is such person ruin'd in his credulity to one authority usurp'd, for his denying it to another, to whom it is due; Nor would M. Claude be well pleased, if any one should follow some few reformed Ministers, divided from the rest of their *Consistory*, *Class*, or *Synod*.

§. 24.

As for the *Trial*, he motions, to be made by *Holy Scriptures*. This is a thing that hath been by the Two Parties already done, first; as it ought. And the issue of it was; That one Party understood these *Scriptures* in one sense, the other in another; For Example. The one understood, *Hoc est Corpus meum*, literally; the other in a *Metaphor*, and so differently understood also all the other Texts of Scripture produced in this Cause. Here, the true sense of Scripture, became the *Question*, and their Controversie. For the Judge and Decider of this Controversie between them, when time was, they took a Council: For, since Scripture they could no more take, the sense of that being their *Question*, to whom should they repair, but the Church? and of the Church a Council is the *Representative*. Councils, several, to a great number, in several ages, decided this matter,

|| See Guide
in Controver.
Disc. I. §. 57.
58.

matter, and declared the sense of the Scriptures; but so, as it liked not one Party. These therefore thought fit to remove the *Trial* from thence to the more Venerable Sentence of the *Fathers*, and *Primitive Church*, i. e. of their *Writings*. Again, the *sense* of these *Writings* as, before, that of *Scriptures*, is understood diversly by the Contesters; and now the true *sense* of the writings of the *Fathers* is the *Question*, and Controversie. Nor, here will *Disputes* end it; Witness so many Replies made on either side. *Former Councils*, as they have given their Judgment of the Sense of the Writings of *Holy Scriptures*, so they have of those of the *Fathers*, but their Authority is rejected, in both; And, a new *Council*, were it now convened, besides that M. Claude's Party, being the fewer, and so, easily over-voted, would never submit to it, we may, from M. Claude's Confession ||, — *That both Greeks and Latins are far departed from the Evangelical simplicity, and the natural explication that the Ancients have given to the Mystery of the Eucharist*, rationally conjecture that *Protestants*, in such Councils, would remain the party condemn'd. What, then, would this person have? He would have the Controversie begin again, and return to the Scriptures. Which is, in plain Language: That, the *Question* should decide the *Controversie*: and, till this can do it, That, so long as the *Protestants* are the *weaker* Party, all should have their Liberty. For, when they are the *stronger*, they do well discern the necessity of *Synods* for ending such Differences; and, though not professing themselves infallible, yet, upon the Evangelical promises of our Lord's assistance to such *Councils*, think fit to require all the *Clergy* under their jurisdiction, upon pain of Suspension from their Function, to receive and subscribe their *Decrees*, for *God's Truth*; and to teach them to the People, as such; and think fit to *Excommunicate* those teaching the contrary, till they shall recant their Error. Of which see before, §. 200. Witness such carriage of the *Synod of Dort* towards the *Remonstrants*, who challenged the same exemption from their Tribunal, as they had done from that of *Trent*; but could not be heard.

As for that which follows, in *Answer* to D. Arnauld's most rational challenging a submission, and Conformity, of so many *Protestants*, as have no certainty of their new Opinions, rather to the *Church*, than to Innovators, to me it sounds thus. That every plain, and simple *Protestant*, 1st. Thinks his *Exposition* or *sense* of *Scripture*, in this Point of the Eucharist, and so in others, any way necessary, to be clear, and without dispute, [and the more simple he is, the sooner he may think so; because he is not able to compare all other Texts, nor to examine the contrary senses given by others, or the reasonable grounds thereof.] 2ly. Next, that every one, who thinks his *Exposition*, or *Sense* of *Scripture* clear in such Point, is by this sufficiently assured, that he hath a *right Faith*; or, from this *sense* of his, knows what he ought to believe, and forms a *judgment* herein as certain, as if one had discussed all the *Controversies*, one after another: [a strange proposition; but I see nothing else, from which such person collects his faith to be right; if any doth, produce it.] 3ly. That every such simple person now easily knows, whether the Society, wherein he lives, be a true Church, or otherwise, viz. as they agree with, or dissent from, that *right Faith* of his, already supposed; or as he finds them to teach the things clearly contained in *God's word*, i. e. in his clear *Sense* thereof. 4ly. Knowing thus, from this his

|| l. 3. c. 13.
p. 337.

his

his clear exposition, or sense of Scripture, what he ought to believe, he needs not trouble himself, what the Ancient Church hath believed; [which is very true:] nay, he knows, without reading them, or M. Arnauld's and M. Claude's discourses upon them, that the *Fathers*, if of the number of the Faithful, were of his Opinion, by M. Claude's arguing fore-mentioned. I desire the Reader to review his words, or, the 5th. and 6th. Chapters of his 1st. Book, and see if he can make any better construction of them. Now, if there be any Sense in this, he saith; How can he hinder, but that a simple *Catholick* may use the self-same Plea (*Church-Authority* being laid aside) for a certainty of his Faith upon the same pretentions, viz. his clear sense of Scripture, quite contrary to the *Protestants* clear sense? And, in any Controversie amongst *Protestants*: (Suppose that of the *Remonstrants* and *Anti-Remonstrants*,) here both sides have the same Plea, one against another; namely, the certainty of their Faith from their own Sense of the Scripture controverted between them. And, why doth not this certainty void their *Synods*? For M. Claude saith, — *The word of God contains nettement and claiement, all that which is necessary to form our Faith, and that the most simple are capable to judge of it, &c.* Unless the *Protestant* Controversies be never about any thing necessary. This is the way M. Claude thought on to leave no *Doubters*, though never so unlearned, among *Protestants*, as to the *Eucharist*, or other Points of their Faith. But mean-while, if, after such Speculations of his, any such *Doubters* there be, I do not find, but that he leaves so many wholly to D. Arnauld's disposal, viz. that they return to, and remain in, the bosome of the former Church so long, till they become certain of its errors; and not follow strangers that have not entred, by the door, into Christ's Fold; and, I hope, they will consider it. As for the settling of our Conscience this person speaks of, by resting our Faith immediately on God's Word, I see not, where the sense of the Scriptures is supposed the thing controverted, how any one rests his Faith more immediately on God's Word, by following his own Exposition or Sense thereof, or the Exposition of a *Minister*, &c. (for some persons exposition he must follow,) than he, that follows that of the Church.

If we are, then, for a total application to the Scriptures, and for searching things to the bottom; Let us search there first this main Point, (that decides all other) concerning our Lord's establishing a just Church-Authority for ending contentions. Where we shall find also; that he is not a God of dissension, or Confusion, in his House, the Church; but of Peace. And, — That he hath given his *Clergy* in a certain Subordination, that We should not be carried about with every wind of Doctrine; as we must be, when ever these disagree in expounding Scripture to us, if we have no Rule, which of them to follow. The truth of this, once found out by our search, will save many other searches; of which, without it, I see no end. In vain do we endeavour, with what-ever pains, to discern God's Truth without the illumination of his Holy Spirit and Grace; and, since *revelat parvulis*, in vain expect this, without great Humility, and self-dis-esteem, and a reverent preference of, and pious Credulity toward our just, and lawful Spiritual Superiors. — *Credendo*, first, [i. e. *Ecclesia*] saith S. Austin in his Tract *De utilitate Credendi* †, *præsumimus, & illuminamur præparamur Deo.*

† c. i.

F I N I S.

